

The Slavic and East European Journal

Spring 1959

Vol. XVII (New Series, Vol. III), No. 1

Published by the
**AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS
OF SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN LANGUAGES**

AATSEEL OFFICERS, 1959

I. National Officers

President: Leon Twarog, Boston Univ.

Vice Presidents: Victor Erlich, Univ. of Washington (Seattle)
Thomas F. Magner, Univ. of Minnesota
Catherine Wolkonsky, Vassar Coll.

Executive Secretary-Treasurer: Edmund Ordon, Wayne State Univ.

II. Chapter Officers

New York Chapter

President: Albert Parry, Colgate Univ.

Vice Presidents: S. J. Sluszk, Fordham Univ.

Catherine Wolkonsky, Vassar Coll.

Olga K. Woronoff, Manhattanville Coll.

Secretary-Treasurer: Olga Fedorof, USAFIT, Syracuse Univ.

New England Chapter

President: Catherine Pastukhova, Smith Coll.

Secretary: Valerie Tumins, Regis Coll.

Massachusetts Chapter

President: Irwin Weil, Brandeis Univ.

Secretary-Treasurer: Eleanor Korzeniewska, Emmanuel Coll.

Pennsylvania Chapter

President: Anthony Salys, Univ. of Pennsylvania

Vice President: Anna Pirscenok, Univ. of Pennsylvania

Secretary-Treasurer: William Langebartel, Temple Univ.

Washington, D. C., Chapter

President: Claude Lemieux, U.S. Naval Academy

Secretary: Harry R. Keller, U.S. Naval Academy

Ohio Chapter

President: Morton Benson, Ohio Univ. (Athens)

Secretary-Treasurer: Mrs. Eugene Sadowski, Columbus

Texas Chapter

President: Eduard Miček, Univ. of Texas

Secretary: Joe Malik, Jr., Univ. of Texas

III. Committee for the Promotion of Russian and Other East European Languages in the American Secondary School

Chairman: Helen B. Yakobson, George Washington Univ.

Secretary: Kyra Bostroem, Park Road Ext., Middlebury, Conn.

* * * *

Subscription to The Slavic and East European Journal is \$5.00 per year for individuals, libraries, and institutions. The subscription includes membership in the AATSEEL. A special rate of \$2.00 per year has been set for undergraduate and graduate students. Single copies may be purchased for \$1.50.

Applications for membership, subscriptions to the Journal, and all other business letters should be sent to the Executive Secretary and Treasurer: Edmund Ordon, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

Communications to the Editor, books for review, manuscripts, exchange journals, and copy for advertisements should be sent to J. T. Shaw, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

The Slavic and East European Journal

Vol. XVII (New Series, Vol. III)

1959

CONTENTS

Benson, Morton: English Loanwords in Russian	248
Duncan, Phillip A.: The Fortunes of Zola's <u>Parižskie</u> <u>pis'ma</u> in Russia	107
Grigorieff, Dmitry Felix: Pasternak and Dostoevskij . . .	335
Harsky, Joseph E.: A Practical Approach to High School Russian	171
Henley, Norman: Soviet Periodicals Initiated in 1958 (Accessioned by the Library of Congress in 1958) in the Fields of Philology, History, Education, and the Cultural Arts	202
Ivask, George: Literary Archives of the Russian Émigrés	137
Kreusler, Abraham: The Soviet Modern Language Reform Movement	160
Krueger, John R.: The Impact of Russian and Western Literature on Mongolia	25
Levin, Norman Balfour: Teaching Russian to the Gifted Child in the Junior High School	268
Lindstrom, Thaïs S.: N. A. Rubakin: Architect of Popular Enlightenment	122
Nosco, Beatrice M.: Zdeněk Nžmeček (1894- 1957), Poet of Czech Emigrants	43
Ornstein, Jacob: Soviet Language Policy: Theory and Practice	1
Pantzer, Eugene E.: Yugoslav Epic Preambles	372
Parker, Fan: The Present Status of Russian in Public, Private, and Parochial Schools of the United States	272
Parker, Fan: Report of the National Information Center on the Status of Russian in Secondary Schools	55
Segel, H. B.: Foreign Drama in Eighteenth Century Polish Dress	35

Senn, Alfred: On the Method of Etymologizing, with Examples from Lithuanian and English.	382
Stankiewicz, Edward: Accent and Vowel Alternations in the Substantive Declension of Modern Standard Slovenian	144
Stenbock-Fermor, Elisabeth: Lermontov and Dostoevskij's Novel <u>The Devils</u>	215
Trahan, Elizabeth Welt: The Golden Age — Dream of a Ridiculous Man?	349
Twarog, Leon: Ivan Bolotnikov in Soviet Historical Fiction	231
Vickery, Walter Neef: Mark Aleksandrovič Ščeglov.	242
Vickery, Walter: Symbolism Aside: <u>Doktor Živago</u>	343
Winner, Thomas G.: Čexov's <u>Ward No. 6</u> and Tolstoyan Ethics	321
Worth, Gerta Hüttl: Foreign Borrowings in Russian	47

REVIEWS

Adamovich, Anthony. <u>Opposition to Sovietization in Belrussian Literature (1917-1957)</u> . . . Ivan Lubachko	401
<u>American Contributions to the Fourth International Congress of Slavists, Moscow, September 1958</u> J. T. Shaw	177
[Andrews, Marshall, ed.] <u>Anatomy of Revolution: A Condensation of the United Nations Report on the Hungarian Uprising</u> A. J. Molnar	306
Andrusyshen, C. H. and J. N. Krett, comp. <u>Ukrainian-English Dictionary</u> Wasyl Lew	196
Armstrong, John A. <u>The Soviet Bureaucratic Elite: A Case Study of the Ukrainian Apparatus</u> Joseph S. Roucek	304
Backus, Oswald P. <u>Motives of West Russian Nobles in Deserting Lithuania for Moscow, 1377-1514</u> Sergei Pushkarev	91
Barnett, Clifford R. et al. <u>Poland: Its People, Its Society, Its Culture</u> Mieczyslaw Giergielewicz	308
Benes, Vaclav L., Robert F. Byrnes, Nicolas Spulber, ed. <u>The Second Soviet-Yugoslav Dispute</u> Robert Tucker	412
Bielfeldt, H. H., ed. <u>Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der russischen Sprache der Gegenwart</u> Gerta Hüttl Worth	293
<u>Biographic Dictionary of the USSR</u> . . . Robert C. Tucker	199
Birkmaier, Emma. <u>Russian Language and Civilization: A Four-Year Course</u> Marjorie McDonald	193
Bojko, Juriij. <u>Tvorčist' Tarasa Ševčenko na tli zaxidn'o-evropejs'koji literatury</u> . . . W. Besoushko	72
Braha, Symon. <u>Mickiewicz i belaruskaja plyn' pol'skaje literatury</u> Yar Slavutych	288

Braun, Miximilian. <u>Der Kampf um die Wirklichkeit in der russischen Literatur</u>	V. Setschkareff	179
Brower, Reuben A., ed. <u>On Translation</u>	J. T. Shaw	281
Byrnes, Robert F. <u>Bibliography of American Publications on East Central Europe, 1945-1957</u>	Marc Raeff	280
Čiževskij, Dmitrij. <u>Aus zwei Welten: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Slavisch-Westlichen literarischen Beziehungen</u>	V. Setschkareff	63
Counts, George S. <u>The Challenge of Soviet Education</u>	Abraham Kreusler	81
Deržavyn, Volodymyr. <u>Antolohija ukrajins'koji poeziji</u>	Yar Slavutych	189
Domger, L. L., ed. <u>Neizdannye pis'ma A. I. Gercena i T. A. Astrakovym</u>	Edward J. Brown	399
Dostoevsky, F. M., <u>The Double</u> , tr. George Bird	George Gibian	396
Durnovo, Nikolaj. <u>Očerki istorii russkogo jazyka</u>	Felix J. Oinas	404
Dziewanowski, M. K. <u>The Communist Party of Poland: An Outline of History</u>	Piotr S. Wandycz	409
Farrell, R. Barry. <u>Jugoslavia and the Soviet Union 1948-1956: An Analysis with Documents</u>	Joseph S. Roucek	198
Fisher, Harold H., ed. <u>American Research on Russia</u>	Edward Stankiewicz, Walter Vickery	389
Fisher, Ralph T., Jr. <u>Pattern for Soviet Youth: A Study of the Congresses of the Komsomol, 1918-1954</u>	Frederick C. Barghoorn	300
French, A., ed. and tr. <u>A Book of Czech Verse</u>	Emil Kovtun	192
Gimbutas, Marija. <u>The Prehistory of Eastern Europe, I</u>	Viktor Kōressaar	82
Gogol, Nikolai. <u>Dead Souls</u> , tr. George Reavy	George Gibian	396
Gorlin, Michel et Bloch-Gorlina, Raïssa. <u>Études littéraires et historiques</u>	Gleb Struve	67
Gul', Roman. <u>Skif v Evrope: Bakunin i Nikolaj I.</u>	Eugene Pyziur	302
Hare, Richard. <u>Portraits of Russian Personalities Between Reform and Revolution</u>	Gleb Struve	391
Hoffman, George W., ed. <u>Recent Soviet Trends</u>	Alfred G. Meyer	202
Holthusen, Johannes. <u>Studien zur Ästhetik und Poetik des russischen Symbolismus</u>	George Ivask	285
Hotchkiss, Christine. <u>Home to Poland</u>	Tatiana Sklanczenko	411
Ivanov, Georgij. <u>1943-1958 stixi</u>	Vladimir Markov	286
Ivić, Pavle. <u>Dijalektologija srpskohrvatskog jezika: Uvod i štokavsko narečje</u>	Michael Samilov	407

Ivić, Pavle. <u>Die serbokroatischen Dialekte: Ihre Struktur und Entwicklung</u> , Vol. I.	Harold L. Klagstad, Jr.	405
<u>Die serbokroatischen Dialekte: Ihre Struktur und Entwicklung</u> , Vol. I.	Michael Samilov	407
Jackson, Robert L. <u>Dostoevsky's Underground Man in Russian Literature</u> ..	Elisabeth Stenbock-Fermor	397
Kapp, Yvonne, ed. <u>Short Stories of Russia Today</u> , tr. Tatiana Shebunina	George Gibian	396
Kennan, George. <u>Siberia and the Exile System</u>	Donald W. Treadgold	84
Kennan, George F. <u>Soviet-American Relations, 1917-1920. Vol. II: The Decision to Intervene</u>	Robert F. Byrnes	200
Klonowicz, S. F. <u>The Boatman: A Voyage down the Vistula from Warsaw to the Green Gate of Danzig</u> , tr. Marion M. Coleman	Watson Kirkconnell	73
Koslow, Jules. <u>The Kremlin: Eight Centuries of Tyranny and Terror</u>	S. Pushkarev	298
Kottmeier, Elisabeth, tr. and ed. <u>Weinstock der Wiedergeburt: Moderne ukrainische Lyrik</u>	Yar Slavutych	189
Laqueur, Walter Z. and George Lichtheim, eds. <u>The Soviet Cultural Scene 1956-1957</u>	Richard Pipes	90
Lensen, George Alexander. <u>The Russian Push Toward Japan: Russo-Japanese Relations, 1697-1875</u>	Robert F. Byrnes	415
Lermontov, Mihail. <u>A Hero of Our Time</u> , tr. Vlamimir Nabokov in collaboration with Dmitri Nabokov	J. T. Shaw	180
Lermontov, Mikhail Yurevich. <u>A Hero of Our Own Times</u> , tr. Eden and Cedar Paul	J. T. Shaw	180
Linieff, Eugenie. <u>Folk Songs of the Ukraine</u> tr. Maria Safonoff	Bruno Nettl	191
<u>Le Livre de la genèse du peuple Ukrainien</u> , tr. Georges Luciani	J. B. Rudnyčkyj	305
Long, John. <u>Modern Russia: An Introduction</u>	Robert F. Byrnes	413
Lord, Albert B. <u>Beginning Serbocroatian</u>	Thomas F. Magner	80
Magner, Thomas F. <u>Manual of Scientific Russian</u>	Ludwig Kruhe	195
Malyšev, V. I.: <u>Povest' o Suxane: Iz istorii russkoj povesti XVII veka</u>	Felix J. Oinas	68
Manning, Clarence A. <u>Hetman of Ukraine Ivan Mazepa</u>	C. Bida	92
Marcel, Simone. <u>Histoire de la littérature polonaise (Des origines au début de XIXe siècle)</u>	Anna M. Cienciala	191

Marcuse, Herbert. <u>Soviet Marxism: A Critical Analysis</u>	Gerhart Niemeyer	87
Mathewson, Rufus W., Jr. <u>The Positive Hero in Russian Literature</u>	Richard Hare	183
Mazour, Anatole G. <u>Modern Russian Historiography</u> , 2nd ed.	Robert F. Byrnes	414
Meyer, Alfred G. <u>Leninism</u>	Robert C. Tucker	299
Míček, Eduard. <u>The Real Tolstoy: Impressions and Evaluation</u>	W. Besoushko	183
Morley, Charles, ed. and tr. <u>Portrait of America: Letters of Henry Sienkiewicz</u>	Waclaw Lednicki	288
Nilsson, Nils Ake. <u>Ibsen in Russland</u> . . .	Z. Folejewski	186
Ordon, Edmund, ed. <u>10 Contemporary Polish Stories</u>	Z. Folejewski	74
Pasternak, Boris. <u>I Remember: Sketch for an Autobiography</u> , tr. David Magarshack. . . .	Helen Muchnic	400
Propp, V. <u>Morphology of the Folktale</u> , ed. Svatava Pirkova-Jakobson, tr. Laurence Scott	Archer Taylor	187
Radishchev, Aleksandr N., <u>A Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow</u> , tr. Leo Wiener, ed. Roderick P. Thaler	J. Daniel Levan	395
Radkey, Oliver H. <u>The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism: Promise and Default of the Russian Socialist Revolutionaries February to October 1917</u>	Gerhart Niemeyer	87
Raeff, Marc. <u>Michael Speransky: Statesman of Imperial Russia 1772-1839</u>	Robert F. Byrnes	89
Rauch, Georg von. <u>A History of Soviet Russia</u>	Richard Pipes	85
Rudnyčkyj, J. B., comp. <u>Readings in Canadian Slavic Folklore, I: Texts in Ukrainian</u>	Wasył Lew	196
Rush, Myron. <u>The Rise of Khrushchev</u>	Gerhart Niemeyer	87
Ryl's'kyj, Maksym and Mykola Nahnybida. <u>Antolohija ukrajins'koji poeziji v 4-ox tomax</u>	Yar Slavutych	189
Seduro, Vladimir: <u>Dostoyevski in Russian Literary Criticism 1846-1956</u>	John C. Fiske	69
Shevelov, George Y. and Fred Holling, eds. <u>A Reader in the History of the Eastern Slavic Languages: Russian, Belorussian, Ukrainian</u>	Gerta Hüttl Worth	291
Slavistična Revija: <u>Časopis za literarno zgodovino in jezik, X letnik, Rajku Nahtigalu za osemdesetletnico</u>	George Y. Shevelov	75
Slavutych, Yar. <u>Ivan Franko i Rosija</u> . . .	V. N. Bandera	287
Slonim, Marc. <u>An Outline of Russian Literature</u>	Gleb Struve	62
Spulber, Nicolas. <u>The Economics of Communist Eastern Europe</u>	Jozo Tomasevich	197

Svane, Gunnar Olaf. <u>Grammatik der Slovenischen Schriftsprache</u>	Edward Stankiewicz	408
Steiner, George. <u>Tolstoy or Dostoevsky: An Essay in the Old Criticism</u>	J. T. Shaw	283
Stender-Petersen, Ad. <u>Russian Studies</u>	Edward Stankiewicz	78
Tschebotarioff-Bill, V., ed. <u>The Russian People: A Reader on Their History and Culture</u>	Marthe Blinoff	294
Tschižewskij, Dmitrij. <u>Paradies und Hölle: Russische Buchmalerei</u>	François Bucher	65
Turgenev, Ivan. <u>Literary Reminiscences and Autobiographical Fragments</u> , tr. David Magarshack	Edgar Lehrman	182
Turkevich, John and Ludmilla B. <u>Turkevich. Russian for the Scientist</u>	Thomas F. Magner	296
Von Gronicka, André and Helen Bates-Yakobson. <u>Essentials of Russian: Reading, Conversation, Grammar</u> (3rd ed.)	Norman Henley	194
Walsh, Warren B., comp. and ed. <u>Readings in Russian History</u> , 3rd ed.	Robert F. Byrnes	414
_____ <u>Russia and the Soviet Union: A Modern History</u>	Robert F. Byrnes	414
Wetter, Gustav A. <u>Dialectical Materialism: A Historical and Systematic Survey of Philosophy in the Soviet Union</u> , tr. Peter Heath.	Robert Tucker	412
Zajcev, Pavlo. <u>Žyttja Tarasa Ševčenka</u>	W. Besoushko	72
Zaunmüller, Wolfram. <u>Bibliographisches Handbuch der Sprachwörterbücher</u>	Thomas A. Sebeok	402
Zavalishin, Vyacheslav. <u>Early Soviet Writers</u>	Edward J. Brown	185
Zen'kovskij, V.: <u>Aus der Geschichte der ästhetischen Ideen in Russland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert</u>	Helene Iswolski	70
Zetlin, Mikhail. <u>The Decembrists</u> , tr. George Panin	M. Raeff	303
Zinner, Paul E., ed. <u>National Communism and Popular Revolt in Eastern Europe: A Selection of Documents on Events in Poland and Hungary, February-November, 1956</u>	A. J. Molnar	306
Zischka, Gert A. <u>Index lexicorum—Bibliographie der lexikalischen Nachschlagewerke</u>	Thomas A. Sebeok	402
Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available.		106, 204, 423
Books Received		94, 204, 309, 415
Transliteration		320, 424
NEWS AND NOTES		95, 206, 311, 417

The Slavic and East European Journal

Vol. XVII (New Series, Vol. III), No. 1

Spring 1959

CONTENTS

Soviet Language Policy: Theory and Practice	Jacob Ornstein	1
The Impact of Russian and Western Literature on Mongolia	John R. Krueger	25
Foreign Drama in Eighteenth Century Polish Dress	H. B. Segel	35
Zdeněk Němeček (1894-1957), Poet of Czech Emigrants	Beatrice M. Nosco	43
Foreign Borrowings in Russian	Gerta Hüttl Worth	47
Report of the National Information Center on the Status of Russian in Secondary Schools	Fan Parker	55
 REVIEWS		
Marc Slonim, <u>An Outline of Russian Literature</u>	Gleb Struve	62
Dmitrij Čiževskij, <u>Aus zwei Welten: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Slavisch-Westlichen literarischen Beziehungen</u>	V. Setschkareff	63
Dmitrij Tschizewskij, <u>Paradies und Hölle: Russische Buchmalerei</u>	François Bucher	65
Michel Gorlin et Raïssa Bloch-Gorlina, <u>Études littéraires et historiques</u>	Gleb Struve	67
V. I. Malyšev, <u>Povest' o Suxane: Iz istorii russkoj povesti XVII veka</u>	Felix J. Oinas	68
Vladimir Seduro, <u>Dostoyevski in Russian Literary Criticism 1846-1956</u>	John C. Fiske	69
V. Zen'kovskij, <u>Aus der Geschichte der ästhetischen Ideen in Russland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert</u>	Helene Iswolski	70
Ju-ij Bojko, <u>Tvorčist' Tarasa Ševčenka na tli zaxidno-evropejs'koji literatury</u> ; Pavlo Zajcev, <u>Žittja Tarasa Ševčenka</u>	W. Besoushko	72
S. J. Klonowicz, <u>The Boatman</u>	Watson Kirkconnell	73

Edmund Ordon, ed., <u>10 Contemporary Polish Stories</u>	Z. Folejewski	74
<u>Slavistična Revija: Časopis za literarno zgodovino in jezik, X letnik, Rajku Nahtigalu za osemdesetletnico</u>	George Y. Shevelov	75
Ad. Stender-Petersen, <u>Russian Studies</u>	Edward Stankiewicz	78
Albert B. Lord, <u>Beginning Serbocroatian</u>	Thomas F. Magner	80
George S. Counts, <u>The Challenge of Soviet Education</u>	Abraham Kreusler	81
Marija Gimbutas, <u>The Prehistory of Eastern Europe, I.</u>	Viktor Kőressaar	82
George Kennan, <u>Siberia and the Exile System</u>	Donald W. Treadgold	84
Georg von Rauch, <u>A History of Soviet Russia</u>	Richard Pipes	85
Myron Rush, <u>The Rise of Khrushchev</u> ; Herbert Marcuse, <u>Soviet Marxism: A Critical Analysis</u> ; Oliver H. Radkey, <u>The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism</u>	Gerhart Niemeyer	87
Marc Raeff, <u>Michael Speransky: Statesman of Imperial Russia 1722-1839</u>	Robert F. Byrnes	89
Walter Z. Laqueur and George Lichtheim, eds., <u>The Soviet Cultural Scene 1956-1957</u>	Richard Pipes	90
Oswald P. Backus, <u>Motives of West Russian Nobles in Deserting Lithuania for Moscow, 1377-1514</u>	Sergei Pushkarev	91
Clarence A. Manning, <u>Hetman of Ukraine Ivan Mazeppa</u>	C. Bida	92
Books Received.		94
NEWS AND NOTES		95
Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available		106

THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

Editor: J. T. Shaw

Associate Editors: Edward Stankiewicz
Walter Vickery

Review Editor: Felix J. Oinas
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

Editorial Committee

Victor Erlich
Zbigniew Folejewski
William E. Harkins
The Rev. Walter C. Jaskiewicz, S.J.
Claude P. Lemieux
Horace Lunt
Oleg A. Maslenikov

J. B. Rudnyćkyj
Anthony Salys
Thomas A. Sebeok
Gleb Struve
Nicholas Vakar
René Wellek

Business Manager: Edmund Ordon
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

Middlebury College

RUSSIAN SCHOOL

Director: Mischa H. Fayer

15th session: June 26-Aug. 13, 1959

Faculty of native teachers •
Courses leading to the M.A. and
D.M.L. degrees in Russian • Ex-
clusive use of Russian both in and
outside the classroom • Russian
dormitories with dining facilities •
Lectures, concerts, folk dancing,
Russian plays and movies



Faculty

Dr. Mischa H. Fayer, Nicholas Fersen, Eugen P. Kalikin, Nicholas Maltzoff, Marianna Poltoratzky, Aron Pressman, Tatiana Vacquier, Catherine Wolkonsky, Nadezhda Yershov, Peter Yershov, Vladimir Seduro, and others.

Lecture and Seminar Courses

Stylistics, Phonetics and Intonation, Pushkin and his Time, Development of Russian Drama, Maxim Gorky; his Works and Influence, Russian Folklore, Russian Art, Methods of Teaching Russian, and a curriculum designed especially for teachers.

Courses in Grammar, Conversation, Composition, and Intermediate Phonetics.

For information write:

Office of the Language Schools
Middlebury College
Middlebury, Vermont

INSTITUTE OF SOVIET STUDIES

Director: Dr. Mischa H. Fayer

2nd session: June 26-August 13, 1959

Courses are offered in Russian by outstanding native authorities in the fields of science, economics, geography, foreign policy, government, propaganda techniques, etc.

Faculty: Nicholas Timasheff, Nicholas Poltoratzky, Iury Taskin, Nicholas Efremov.

Aim of Institute: To give the specialist in the above fields near-native fluency in Russian and competence in the technical terminology of his specialization, not only for reading and research, but also for oral use.

Students enrolled in the Institute enjoy all the privileges and share in all the activities of the Russian School. They are pledged to the exclusive use of Russian; they share the same dormitory and dining facilities; they attend the evening lectures, concerts, plays, and all other extra-curricular activities in the Russian atmosphere.

Literature on the Institute will be mailed, on request to:

Dr. Mischa H. Fayer, Director
Institute of Soviet Studies
Middlebury College
Middlebury, Vermont

BASIC RUSSIAN

a new textbook of Russian for beginners

BY REBECCA A. DOMAR

Columbia University

This book offers a new and simple approach to the study of Russian and enables the beginner to master the basic structure of Russian in one semester. It is based on fifteen years of teaching experience and has been tested in classes.

Each lesson consists of a **CONNECTED READING TEXT**, vocabulary, simple and clear grammar explanations, and several exercises for oral and written drill. The book may be used for the reading as well as for the conversational approach to the study of Russian. It has already been adopted by a number of schools, among them several high schools.

First printing: October 1958.

Second printing: Spring 1959.

488 pages

Text price in soft covers \$5.00, in hard cloth covers \$5.75.

To obtain an examination copy, write to Rebecca A. Domar, Butler Hall, 400 West 119 Street, New York 27, N.Y.

Readers for intermediate Russian courses:

Stories from the Soviet humorous journal "Krokodil" (now available).

Short stories by A. Chekhov (fall publication).

Short stories by contemporary writers (fall publication).

A Wide Choice of Textbooks—Teaching Aids

for study of **RUSSIAN** by non-Russian students regularly used
in middle school and colleges in the **USSR**

**LATEST EDITIONS of ENGLISH-RUSSIAN and RUSSIAN-ENGLISH
DICTIONARIES** (new orthography)

GEOGRAPHICAL ATLASES and MAPS

Inexpensive editions of Russian **CLASSIC WORKS** used by most
American schools for students' reading assignments

TALKING PHONOGRAPH RECORDS

acts from plays — monologues

Excellent for students' practice study in pronunciation

Ask for our **TX 59 Catalogue**

Four Continent Book Corp.

822 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

Phone: GR 3-2018

NEW ARRIVALS

- American Contributions to the Fourth International Congress of Slavists, Moscow, September 1958* (Slavic Printings and Reprintings, XXI). 428 pp. \$12.50
- Jackson, R. L. *Dostoevsky's Underground Man in Russian Literature* (Slavic Printings and Reprintings, XV). 224 pp. \$7.00
- Karpovich, M. *A Lecture on Russian History*. Russ. text annotated by H. G. Lunt. 74 pp. \$1.25
- Kridl, M. *The Lyric Poems of J. Slowacki* (Musagetes, VI). 77 pp., pap. \$1.75
- Lord, A. B. *Beginning Serbocroatian*. 131 pp. \$4.00
- Souckova, M. *The Czech Romantics* (Slavic Printings and Reprintings, XVII). 168 pp. \$4.25
- Stief, C. *Studies in the Russian Historical Song*. 274 pp. \$10.50

GREGORY LOUNZ

Dept. S

11 East 45th Street

New York 17, N.Y.

A New Book on Tolstoy

THE REAL TOLSTOY, a new book on the great 19th Century Russian novelist, presents the "impressions and evaluation" of a lifelong student of Tolstoy, Dr. EDWARD MICEK, University of Texas Professor of Slavonic Languages.

As a college student in 1909, Dr. Micek went to Russia from his native Czechoslovakia to meet Tolstoy and learn more about his life and work. Later he wrote several articles and gave lectures about Tolstoy.

The new book anticipates the 1960 commemoration of the 50th anniversary of Tolstoy's death. Dr. Micek's book is a timely study of the writer's importance and influence.

Copies of **THE REAL TOLSTOY** may be ordered at \$2 each from Czech Literary Society, University Station, Box 7555, Austin 12, Texas.

SLAVICA

All on Eastern Europe

Rare and Out of Print Books

Scholarly Books published in
Eastern Europe

Catalogues issued monthly

Want Lists invited

DR. ALEXANDER HERTZ

77-05 41st Avenue
Jackson Heights 73, L.I., N.Y.
Telephone: HA9 40-82

**Indiana University
NINTH ANNUAL
RUSSIAN WORKSHOP
and
INSTITUTE FOR TEACHERS**

June 8 to August 7, 1959

An eight-week full-time intensive course in Russian

Equivalent to a full college year of instruction

Limited enrollment, small classes

Supervised study, conversation groups, lectures, films, plays

Levels: Group I: Elementary
Group II: Intermediate
Group III: Third-Year
Group IV: Advanced

Intermediate and advanced classes completely in Russian

Credit: 9 or 10 semester hours, undergraduate or graduate

Costs: Room, board, and tuition—\$300-\$312

For further information and application forms, write

DR. JOSEPH T. SHAW
Director, Russian Workshop and
Institute
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

Bronx, New York

SUMMER SESSION - 1959

**Courses in
RUSSIAN and LITHUANIAN**

**Language
Culture**

July 6 - August 14

**College and Graduate credit
for qualified students**

* * * * *

Write:

**The Institute of Russian Studies
Fordham University
New York 58, N. Y.**

June 22 August 8
**COLBY COLLEGE
SUMMER SCHOOL OF
LANGUAGES**

**French • German • Russian
• Spanish**

Intensive courses at the college level

Six semester hours of transfer credit

Small classes, individual instruction

Experienced native or bilingual faculty

Friendly instructor-student relations

Grouping in dormitories by languages

Use of records, phonographs, recorders

Period courses in French literature

Supplementary readings to meet

Requirements for advanced degrees

For catalog, address
Prof. John F. McCoy, Director
Waterville, Maine

**Typewriters in Russian
and Other Languages**

New and reconditioned machines available . . . Portables and office size . . . Also other business machines.

**ALL LANGUAGES TYPEWRITER
CO.**

Dept. SE
119 W. 23rd St., New York 11, N.Y.
CHelsea 3-8086

SOVIET LANGUAGE POLICY: THEORY AND PRACTICE

By Jacob Ornstein

Russian Research Center, Harvard University
and

U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Graduate School,
Washington, D.C.

A. General Background.

The past few years have witnessed an unprecedented interest in the language problems of multilingual states. Language riots on the Indian subcontinent and the preoccupation of the Peking Communist regime with linguistic issues highlight the importance of language in the dynamics of twentieth century politics. As for the Soviet Union, both linguists and social scientists have tended to shun this aspect of Russian affairs, or to dwell upon its more theoretical and polemical aspects. Selig S. Harrison has this to say: "While the importance of the multilingual nature of the Soviet State has long been recognized, the study of this aspect of the Soviet Union gained momentum only from the interdisciplinary approach in recent Soviet area studies. This absence of unified study confronting the social and political impact of language now looms as a serious limitation in the understanding of a changing world."¹ Likewise Uriel Weinreich, in his classic work Languages in Contact, stresses the need of approaching the phenomenon of multilingualism from both the linguistic and the socio-cultural viewpoints.²

In approaching Soviet language policy, it is sufficient to cast only a fleeting glance backward at practices in pre-Revolutionary Russia. Most of the Czars entertained little sympathy for the languages and cultures of the non-Russian subject peoples, and followed a policy of Russification, of varying intensity.

The Soviet regime came to power with the help of important segments of the national groups which hoped, by aiding the revolution, to achieve independence or at least

autonomy. The record shows, however, that after a ten-year period of relative linguistic liberalism, the Soviets in the early 1930's embarked upon their own type of linguistic Russification.

The scope of this paper does not permit a detailed description of the historical genesis of Soviet language policy. The most complete treatment of the subject in English is the recent dissertation of Henry Kučera, which unfortunately still remains unpublished.³ However, in very broad strokes something of the background will be noted.

In the period of liberalism marking the 1920's an attempt was made to apply the Leninist slogan, "national in form, socialist in content." The ethnic groups of the Soviet Union were to be given full opportunity to develop their own languages so as to equip them to express the concepts of a modern, industrialized society. As Weinreich points out, this was done in two ways. One was to borrow from a "culture language," which had traditionally served as a source of enrichment (as Persian for Tadzhik). Another and more popular method was to dispatch linguistic commissions to remote areas, where the dialects had supposedly been preserved in a more "pristine" form. Semi-illiterate peasants thus become the sources for the new dictionaries and linguistic treatises which linguists of the many nationalities hastened to prepare. Thus was the new Soviet science of lingvotexnika created and ardently pursued.⁴ The Latin alphabet was declared a fine weapon in the struggle to achieve an international socialist society and adapted for use by one language after another. In addition to these linguistic measures, the process of what has been termed functional korenizacija was begun in the early 1920's. This meant the appointment of officials fluent in native languages to administrative positions in the non-Russian areas.

Frightened by the possibility of creating a linguistic Frankenstein by encouraging this type of self-determination, the regime in the early 1930's renounced the principle of linguistic parity. Alarums were raised against the sin of "bourgeois nationalism," and it was officially demanded that dictionaries and other language treatises be purged of "archaisms," "dialectal forms," and terms derived from the languages of "feudal oppressors." The Latin alphabet, adopted by all non-Slavic tongues except Armenian, Georgian, Abxaz, and Yiddish, was declared anti-proletarian

and abandoned in favor of Cyrillic. From then on, for almost 30 years a policy of Soviet Russification has been pursued, in which the regime, although allowing the national languages more importance than did the Czars, nevertheless has systematically circumscribed their role for communication in the Soviet Union.

At this point, it is necessary to note how this policy actually squares with the linguistic theories of the Soviet founding fathers. Lenin, like Kautsky, envisioned the eventual use of a single language as a means for achieving solidarity under socialism. At the same time, he opposed the idea of forcible coercion to impose Russian upon the peoples of the Soviet Union. In 1914 he stated: "We do not want to drive them [the non-Russian peoples] into paradise with a stick."⁶ In practice, however, references to any single language were avoided as expressions of chauvinism.

As for Stalin, he affirmed in 1925, in the much-quoted talk before the University of the Peoples of the East: "I have very little faith in this creation of a single universal language and the dying away of all other tongues in the period of socialism. I have very little faith in this theory of a single, all-embracing language. Experience in every case speaks not for, but against this theory."⁷ Stalin, however, was to reverse his position when, speaking before the Central Committee of the Sixteenth Party Congress, he predicted that when world socialism would be achieved, national cultures and languages would die away and merge into one common socialist culture and one common tongue, which would be neither Russian, German, nor English, but a new language which would have assimilated the best elements of these national and zonal languages.

To these conflicting theories, one must add those of N. Ja. Marr, until his death in 1934 the high priest of Soviet linguistics. In his dotage Marr had evolved his Japhetic theory, a weird mixture of fact and fantasy. According to it, all languages were derived from a common source and were divided into four types, corresponding to their relative stages of development. Only those in the fourth stage, including Russian and all the Indo-European tongues, had any future; they would provide the material for a future world language, which would evolve when socialism was achieved. Seeking to reconcile his theory with Marxism, he also declared that human language was part of the superstructure

resting upon the economic base of society, and therefore a class manifestation.⁹

In 1950 the world was treated to the spectacle of a powerful dictator intervening in a linguistic controversy. Exhuming the ghost of Marr, then dead almost 20 years, Joseph Stalin declared the Japhetic theory false, particularly in its assertion that language is a class manifestation. When world socialism would be attained, he argued, and the mistrust of nations eliminated, the national languages would cross-fertilize one another. Then hundreds of national languages would fuse into zonal languages, and these would merge into one tongue—the international medium of socialism.¹⁰ Stalin also paid his respects to the national languages, asserting that their enrichment by Russian was a natural process, thus reaffirming a theoretical justification for continued Russification.

During the controversy and afterwards the “new doctrine” of Marr and his followers was blamed for everything that ailed Soviet linguistics and language teaching.¹¹ In a programmatic statement, Mordinov charged Marr with attempting to Russify the non-Russian languages through a “mechanical hybridization.” He stated, “This harmful approach, involving a break with the existing laws of the national languages, led to anarchy in orthography, to innumerable difficulties in the mastery of the grammar of the national languages, and to hardships in the work of local newspapers and magazines.”¹² Despite all these theoretical statements, and the high-sounding verbiage attending the Marrist controversy, however, no fundamental change has taken place in the policy of Russification initiated in the early 1930's.

B. Soviet Patterns of Russification.

Although Russification had been relaxed for strategic reasons during World War II, barely had the conflict ended when the policy was resumed with renewed vigor. The clarification call was sounded by V. V. Vinogradov, now director of the Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences, in his Velikij russkij jazyk, a book going far beyond the bounds of linguistics in its mystic glorification of the Russian language and the qualities which uniquely qualify it to

serve as the medium of communication of the Soviet peoples and the ideas of Communism. He wrote: "The Russian language as a language of high culture is the ideal and pattern for the languages of the other nationalities. From it they derive the vocabulary and phraseology relating to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and to the process of Socialist construction.... The Russian language has become for the languages of the other nations within the borders of the U.S.S.R. a source, a rich reservoir of new concepts, of a new system of visualizing reality."¹³

The Marr controversy provided an excellent psychological moment to reaffirm the official principles of linguistic Russification. In an important article, A. Mordinov and G. Sanžeev stated: "The enrichment of the lexical stock of the languages of the U.S.S.R. through borrowing from Russian is a natural, logical, and necessary process.... The struggle for the purity of the national languages means above all to guard them from corruption by the jargon of exploiting circles, archaic terms, religious lexicon, and from every type of alien word."¹⁴

At the same time it was demanded the linguists should no longer, like the Marrists, violate the "internal laws" of the national languages. According to this concept, hinted at by Stalin during the controversy and elaborated by Vinogradov in 1952, languages change not by "leaps and bounds," as Marr had held, but gradually. Moreover, while a language may change as a result of contact with another, thanks to the "internal laws" its lexical and grammatical basis displays remarkable stability.¹⁵ The theory, highly abstract and contradictory, appears to be poorly understood by Soviet linguists, who mention it repeatedly in discussions of the national languages, but it seems to make little or no difference on the practical level.

Turning to linguistic Russification itself, one may note that discussions of this process have greatly oversimplified it. Numerous factors, such as the number of speakers of a given language, its prestige and continuity of literary and cultural tradition, location and mode of living of the speech community, their Soviet acculturation, strength of ethnic pride, and what Heinz Kloss terms "sociological completeness,"¹⁶ or its ability to express the concepts of a modern, industrialized society, all combine to determine the extent to which Russian leaves its linguistic imprint. Accordingly,

a pyramid might be constructed, with positions assigned to the national languages according to their degree of Russification.

At the top of the "Russification pyramid" belong the languages of very small ethnic groups, "sociologically incomplete" and with little linguistic resistance. Fully qualifying in this category would be, for instance, the Paleo-Siberian Kamchadal language spoken by less than 1,000 persons on the West coast of Kamchatka, and which is a deeply Russianized and rapidly vanishing remnant of the former western dialect. Most of the speakers have by now replaced it by a Russian imbued with native habits.¹⁷ The obsolescence and dying of tongues is, of course, a normal process not restricted to the Soviet Union. An interesting problem frequently connected with it is the persistence for a time of features of the old language in the adopted tongue.

This type of linguistic shift is taking place among various speech communities in the USSR. Felix Oinas, in a study of Russian calques in the Balto-Finnic tongues, gives numerous examples of the heavy penetration of both Russian loan words and loan translations. For instance, Olonetsian siätoi (bad weather) is patterned after bespogodica, the Votic selle takaz (ago) after tomu nazad, the Ludic panna strok (to fix a term) after the Russian položit' srok, and so on. He concludes that "the bulk of eastern Balto-Finnic peoples are now giving up their own languages for Russian."¹⁸

At the bottom of the "Russification pyramid" one would place the languages of large ethnic groups, such as Georgian and Armenian, possessed of a high degree of national consciousness and a well-developed cultural tradition, hence able to resist better the impact of the Russian language. Even so, these tongues have not been exempt from the process of "enrichment" through Great Russian.

The first line of attack in Soviet linguistic Russification has been the lexicon of a given language, with attention paid mostly to nouns and to a lesser extent to adjectives and verbs, with little attention to the remaining parts of speech.¹⁹ The best sources for tracing the official changes in vocabulary are the successive editions of the Academy dictionaries issued during Soviet times. In Ukrainian, for example, a concerted effort has been made to eliminate all items thought to be of "Polish-Galician," or "dialectal" origin in favor of Great Russian. Shevelov has pointed out, by

way of illustration, that adresa (address), felt to be too close to the Polish equivalent, has been replaced by the Russian adres, oseredok (center) by centr, gudzik (knob) by knopka, perven' (element) by element.²⁰ In the case of both Ukrainian and Belorussian, every attempt is made to relate them as closely as possible to Great Russian.

The Turkic languages—spoken by the largest single ethnic groups after the Ukrainians—have been a special target for Russification. In the first place, everything possible has been done to differentiate from one another what are essentially dialects of something which might be called Turki. Obviously this is aimed against Pan-Turkism, or similar sentiments encouraged by linguistic unity. In the second place, an unceasing war has been waged against Arabic, Persian, and Turkic elements in these tongues, particularly in the abstract vocabularies. Ščerbak reports studies made by Rešetov and Borovkov, demonstrating that during the period 1923-40 the number of "Soviet international" words in periodical literature increased from 5 to 15 percent, while the percentage of Arabic-Persian vocabulary decreased from 37.4 to 25 percent.²¹

Even a random examination of the dictionaries of contemporary newspapers of, let us say, Kazakh, Turkmen, Kirghiz, and Uzbek, reveals how far advanced is the process of replacing words of other origins by Russian equivalents in the economic, political, sociological, scientific, and technological fields—which might well be called the "obligatory lexical categories" of Russification. For example, in all these tongues the word inqilab (revolution) has been replaced by revolucija, firqa (party) by partija, džumhurija (republic) by respublika, and so on. A spot heading of the January 14, 1958, issue of Kizil Uzbekiston, published in Tashkent, yielded a number of words not in the "obligatory categories," such as rol' (role), park (park), stakan (glass), ataka (attack), kino (movie), and numerous others. The writer's study of Russian influence on the Uzbek lexicon is, however, not far enough advanced to permit further refinement of this point.

All efforts have been made to set off Tadzhik, an Iranian language, from the closely related Persian. According to a contributor to the Central Asian Review, more than 10 percent of the lexical items in the 1954 Tadzhik-Russian dictionary printed in Moscow in 1954 are loans or

Russo-Tadzhik hybrids. In technical dictionaries the proportion was even more striking. In the Dictionary of Chemistry published in Stalinabad in 1954, of the 3,200 items, 2,040 are direct Russian loans, 640 hybrids, and only 550 Tadzhik items.²²

That Soviet linguists are by no means satisfied with the status and progress of Russification has been made painfully clear ever since the Marr controversy. Constant criticism is leveled in linguistics literature against the failure to make sufficient use of Russian loan words on one hand, and the raznoboј, or the lack of uniformity in their use, on the other. Typical of such statements is an article on Uzbek scientific-technological terminology by I. Rasulev, who writes, "Various linguists, writers, and translators do not yet appreciate the role and significance of Russian as a course, nor have they overcome their urge to corrupt the Uzbek language through Arabic-Persian terms so alien and incomprehensible to the people."²³ This, he remarks, results in raznoboј, of which he furnishes abundant examples. For instance, in Uzbek technical literature, "frequency of oscillation" is rendered arbitrarily either as tebranish chastotasi or tebranish takrorligi, while "critical temperature" appears either as kritik temperatura or tankidii temperatura.²⁴

Writing in similar vein regarding the Dagestan languages of the Caucasus, Š. I. Mixajlov complains of the rampant raznoboј and gives examples. For instance, he notes that in the October 21, 1952, edition of the multilingual Dagestanskaja Pravda the term dvorec kul'tury appeared as dvorec kul'tury in Russian, Darghinian, Lezghian, and Kumyk, although the Avar translator resolved the problem by resuscitating the archaism kLagIa, a term which had "outlived its usefulness . . . and all but forgotten, communicates nothing to the reader."²⁵

For the present, at least, linguistic Russification appears to be mainly concerned with standardizing the "obligatory categories" of the lexicons of the national languages. As for phonology and grammar, these are much less objects of official concern. Nevertheless, Soviet linguists do not fail to applaud all cases of Russian influence. A. S. Sidorov points out that, as a result of contact with Russian, prepalatal affricates have lost their affrication, and remarks that this, together with other features, "brings the phonological

systems of the Komi and Russian languages closer together."²⁶ N. A. Baskakov has provided extensive data on Russian influence on the Turkic tongues. For example, he notes that in this group, vowel harmony is breaking down and new consonant clusters have now been integrated into the various Turkic sound systems; e.g., initial syllables of the type bra, brar, brabr, are now admissible in the various languages.²⁷

As regards grammar, Soviet linguists have pointed out the increasing influence of Russian on the morphological structure of the national languages. For example, Sidorov has indicated the development of verbal aspects in Komi.²⁸ Ščerbak has pointed out the borrowing of Russian morphemes in Uzbek.²⁹

Such Soviet linguistic writings provide a corpus of materials upon which Western scholars might draw to study the role which extensive and enforced lexical borrowing has played in modifying the phonology and morphology of the languages of the U.S.S.R. In this connection Jakobson remarks: "Nous voyons que les emprunts par eux-mêmes ne modifient pas la phonologie propre de la langue: ce n'est que leur assimilation qui est capable d'y introduire des éléments nouveaux. Or, même dans ce dernier cas, la langue ne s'approprie pas nécessairement des éléments insolites."³⁰ Whether one accepts this view or not, the Jakobsonian concept of the necessity of examining linguistic processes from both the diachronic and synchronic viewpoints has serious implications for the study of Russian influence upon the national languages.

The entire question of the integration of Russian lexical items in the native languages is an intriguing one. For years the insistence that these must be accepted in their Russian spelling created enormous orthographic and phonological confusion.³¹ So great has been the chaos that cases have been cited of brilliant non-Russian students failing examinations in their mother tongue because of the contradictory norms of usage. At any rate, the battle over the orthography of loan words has waxed furious over the years. A favorite argument of one school of thought was that to keep spellings in their Russian form is useful as a bridge to non-Russians faced with the necessity of learning this language. Bitter criticism of this situation in 1950 brought promises of a policy in which the sound patterns of the national

languages would be taken more into consideration in the loan process. At the present writing, however, debate still continues and a uniform policy has not been adopted.³²

The Marr controversy, which provided an opportunity for a general washing of the Soviet linguistic linen, also witnessed especially bitter criticism of orthographic practices, and the arbitrary decrees handed down by linguistic authorities. An editorial in a 1952 issue of the Voprosy Jazykoznanija commented: "Many contemporary national languages of the peoples of the U. S. S. R. need review and a standardization of their writing systems. The alphabets and spelling rules adopted in the late 1930's have in practice revealed a number of weaknesses. These weaknesses can be eliminated without serious damage or breakup of the writing systems."³³ All signs thus point to an increase in the extent of Russification of the "obligatory categories," accompanied by a drive to eliminate still existing items of non-Russian origin in these categories.³⁴ This signifies an end to even the present degree of lexical free variation. A by-product of this will probably be a re-examination and adjustment of the writing systems. Thus a type of Soviet standardization of the national languages along the lines discussed appears to be on the agenda of Soviet linguistic policy makers.

C. Teaching of the Russian Language.

One of the most effective instruments of Russification is the teaching of the Russian language itself, which, like the linguistic aspects of the policy, has been progressively intensified since the 1920's. At present, primary instruction is conducted in 59 of the national languages, while the study of Russian is introduced in the second or third year and taught each year. As a result, at least in the ten-year schools in non-Russian areas, the student is exposed to about as much, if not more, Russian than his native language.

Higher education, with notable exceptions in the Ukraine, Belorussia, Armenia and Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and Moldavia, is carried on almost exclusively in Russian. Since most vuz'es require non-Russians to pass an entrance examination in Russian language and literature, the incentive for learning Russian is great, while no such

compelling stimulus exists for the native languages beyond the primary grades.³⁵

Apparently the regime is greatly dissatisfied with the degree of bilingualism achieved by the younger generation and has begun a drive to step up the tempo of Russian teaching. The R.S.F.S.R. Ministry of Education, during August 21-25, 1956, sponsored an Interrepublic Conference on the Improvement of Teaching of Russian in Non-Russian Areas, in Tashkent. N. A. Muxtidinov, then First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Uzbek Communist Party and now member of the Presidium of the All-Union Communist Party, in opening the conference shed important light on the linguistic situation in non-Russian areas: "We cannot fail to be distressed by the fact that the students in many Uzbek and other non-Russian general schools do not have a sufficient command of the spoken [Russian] language, cannot easily make use of literature in the Russian language, are not able to express their thoughts in a correct Russian sentence. For this reason many graduates of our schools experience great difficulty in going on to advanced studies in the field of Soviet technology and in taking their place in industrial and agricultural production."³⁶

As a result of the conference and of a mounting volume of complaints in such journals as Russkij jazyk v škole and Inostrannye jazyki v škole, educational organs called for the improvement of standards, and an intensification of the Russian teaching program.³⁷ Attempts are being made to rewrite the Russian language texts, which have been bitterly criticized for failing to take the learner's native language into consideration. Little can probably be done about the frequently decried ignorance by Russian-language teachers of the mother tongue of the students. One concrete result of the Tashkent conference has been the founding of a new journal entitled Russkij jazyk v ne-russkoj škole, which began publication in mid-1957.

Another measure intended to improve the level of Russian knowledge in Soviet bilinguals is that of introducing the language earlier in the primary school. The Ministry of Education of the Armenian S.S.R. has announced that beginning in 1957-58, Russian will be introduced in the first grade.³⁸ The trend is obvious when it is noted that Armenian schools had in 1948 moved Russian instruction down from the third to the second grade.

Little more need be said other than that the equation of a knowledge of Russian with vocational opportunity, and its progressive significance as the student climbs the educational ladder, puts the national languages at a disadvantage which is certain to minimize their role.

D. Bilingualism, Mass Media, and the Soviet System.

Although there is a massive literature on bilingualism,³⁹ Western scholars have thus far undertaken no synthetic studies on the relative roles of Russian and the national languages in the Soviet net of oral and written communication, against which one might better view the total impact of Russification. Obviously, bilingualism in a rigidly controlled multilingual state has its special features.

New approaches to bilingualism may yield important results both for the linguist and the social scientists. Joseph Greenberg has shown how statistical method can be employed to attain a rating for the "linguistic diversity" of an area.⁴⁰ Weinreich, in a recent article, has demonstrated how one may arrive at the index of the "rate of flow of communication" in terms of its efficiency for the speech community, "as one measurable aspect of communication that the quantitatively minded political scientist can utilize in analyzing the formation of nations and other power groupings."⁴¹ Karl Deutsch applies communication-theory principles in exploring communication barriers as causes of social and other differentiations.⁴² Einar Haugen has also furnished fresh insights into other aspects of bilingualism.⁴³

The task of analyzing Soviet bilingualism is admittedly a formidable one. A large number of factors, both linguistic and extra-linguistic, would have to be considered in studying each speech community, including: age, sex, ethnic origin, education, urban or rural residence, occupation, speakers' attitudes toward mother tongue versus Russian, and the like. It would be important to establish the "dominance configuration"⁴⁴ to determine what is the "dominant" or the "upper" versus the "lower" language.⁴⁵ For example, although Russian can undoubtedly be established as the "dominant" language for a great deal of the U.S.S.R. it is doubtful that this would be valid for the Georgian speech community.

The question of demography also needs careful consideration. The increasing emphasis on decentralization of

industry and the development of the virgin lands in Asia is even now bringing large influxes of Russian and Ukrainian speakers to the non-Russian areas. In Siberia and the Soviet Far East, of a population of almost 40 million, only about 7 million are non-Russians. Richard Pipes, an authority on Soviet nationalities, points out that in Kazakhstan, the largest non-Russian area after Siberia, the Great Russians and the Ukrainians already outnumber the Kazakhs by 4.6 to 3.4 million.⁴⁶

Of particular relevance is the question of the extent to which the special features of the Soviet system, such as its collectivistic tendencies and its domination by the Great Russian group, have produced linguistic shifts. What is the language of, let us say, a kolkhoz or industrial combine in the Urals, where large contingents of Russian administrators and specialists are assigned? What about the development of lingua francas or hybrid speech in such contact situations? The role of the Soviet Army, as a Russifying agent also needs to be considered. Bilinsky cites an interview with an ex-Soviet colonel who affirmed that the years of military service in the Army represent for many rural youths their heaviest exposure to the Russian language.⁴⁷

An excellent source of information on the relative roles of Russian and the national languages is the testimony of refugees. The recent Harvard University Project on the Soviet Social System, based on interviews with Soviet defectors, included a "nationality questionnaire," with queries on ethnic identification, group attitudes, and language usage. On the basis of these, Bauer, Inkeles, and Kluckhohn concluded that: "... the Russian language is making massive inroads among Ukrainians ... 75 per cent could read and write Russian in addition to Ukrainian, almost 60 per cent read a Russian-language newspaper while in the Soviet Union, and almost 20 per cent spoke Russian at home ... "⁴⁸ Of another Slavic group they remarked: "Defectors report that city people often avoid using the Byelorussian language in the street lest they be suspected of 'bourgeois nationalism.' "⁴⁹

Extensive data on Ukrainian bilingualism is offered by Yaroslav Bilinsky in his study, based to a large extent on interviews with former Soviet citizens. His evidence reveals a great deal of pressure, subtle and otherwise, in favor of Russian.⁵⁰ According to defector testimony, on the eve of

World War II, and undoubtedly at present, "if an educated Ukrainian in one of the large cities, who was fluent in both Ukrainian and Russian, chose to speak his native language, this was regarded not only as a sign of mauvais ton, but as Ukrainian nationalism, an act of political insubordination."⁵¹ Yet he notes: "Haggling over the price of eggs and cabbages in the native peasant market is in Ukrainian as it used to be even in Tsarist times."⁵² The overwhelming use of Russian in the cities, and Ukrainian in the countryside, presents a pattern paralleled in many if not most non-Russian areas.

Richard Pipes, in a study utilizing data gained from defectors, furnishes insight into the situation in Central Asia. He notes of the rural population that they "seem to be as ignorant of Russian as their ancestors had been."⁵³ According to him, bilingualism is to be found mostly among the city intelligentsia, who in part identify their interests with those of the regime. Of the Russian influx he remarks that "this has not led to the emergence of a new, third nationality, 'Soviet' in its culture, but to the split of the population of Central Asia into two parts: this split has tended to crystallize the national consciousness of both groups."⁵⁴

Studies of the type just mentioned ought to be reinforced by a much-needed analysis of the comparative role of Russian and the national languages in the government-controlled mass media. The presentation of some crude data from Soviet sources may serve to point up the implications of such investigation. The recent appearance of a series of statistical handbooks, published by the U. S. S. R. with official figures of the 40 years of Soviet accomplishment, makes this an opportune moment for an undertaking of this nature.

A great deal of information on the languages of publication is provided in Pečat' SSR za sorok let 1917-1957.⁵⁵ In it one learns that in 1956 a total of 58,034 titles were printed in the U. S. S. R., of which 43,730 or almost 80 percent appeared in Russian. Of these Russian titles, a total of 917,014 volumes were produced, while only 162,882 volumes, or considerably smaller editions, were made of the 14,304 non-Russian books.⁵⁶ It has, indeed, been suggested that a tacit policy of limiting the editions of non-Russian books is followed.

It is also interesting to look at the relative proportions of book titles which appear in Russian and the national

language of a given area. According to the same source, in 1956 a total of 5,982 titles were printed in the Ukraine, of which 2,673, or less than half, appeared in Ukrainian. In Belorussia, of the 742 titles in 1956 only 285, or less than a third, were printed in Belorussian. Although these proportions vary, and are heavily in favor of the national languages in such areas as Armenia and Georgia, the proportion of Russian books rarely falls below 25 percent.⁵⁷ No breakdown is given for the smaller areas, but one may safely assume an overwhelming proportion of Russian-language books in such regions.

No figures are given for the number of Russian books which in any given area are distributed by Glavizdat and Glaviztorg from Moscow, which would also affect the balance.

As for periodicals, the same handbook indicates a heavy representation of Russian-language newspapers and journals. The proportion is most striking in Kazakhstan, where of 380 newspapers, only 145 are in Kazakh, the remainder in Russian.⁵⁸ No breakdown is offered for the smaller ethnic groups.

Another problem needing elaboration is the type of materials printed in Russian and national languages; respectively. Here again one could construct a sliding scale or pyramid for diversity of function, at the bottom of which would be such a language as Tat,⁵⁹ used only for primary school texts, plus a few works on folk literature and on Marxism-Leninism, and having at its peak such tongues as Ukrainian, in which appear treatises on medicine, engineering, and other highly specialized subjects.

There appears to be a growing trend toward bilingual publications. The Vestnik's of the Academies of Sciences of a number of Central Asian republics appear mostly in Russian, with summaries in the native language and sometimes even in English! Announcements appear quite frequently of new periodicals launched in several tongues. For example, recently the Riga city party organization launched a bilingual weekly entitled Golos Rigi—Rigas Balsas, in both Russian and Latvian.⁶⁰

Information is needed on the language of radio broadcasting. As is the case with primary school instruction, domestic broadcasting is conducted in about 60 languages. What are the relative proportions of Russian and the mother

tongues in a given area? Here note must be taken of the ubiquitous loudspeaker system, which ensures that in public places and conveyances citizens will listen to the spoken Soviet word—in Russian and the native languages—whether they wish to or not. Likewise, in which languages do public and shop signs, tickets, railway schedules, and the like appear?

Another question is that of the languages of the theater. In Belorussia, of the 8 permanent theaters, only three present performances in Belorussian. In the Udmurt A.S.S.R., only one theater of the four performs in the native language. By contrast, in the Georgian S.S.R., 17 of the 20 theaters perform in Georgian, and in the Mari A.S.S.R. two of the three theaters give plays in the native Cheremis.⁶¹ Data on movies would also be revealing.

The relative roles of Russian and the national languages for both written and spoken communication in Soviet administration is another pertinent question. Judging from comments in the provincial press, the regime is somewhat embarrassed about the disproportion between the use of Russian and the national tongues. In an article in the Kazaxstanskaja Pravda, one reads:

In this connection there are serious defects. In many offices they have ceased to conduct legal affairs in the Kazakh tongue. Glaring abuses are to be observed in the ministries of agriculture, of the sovkhozes, of commerce, culture, and in the organs of justice. These organs are closely bound with the broad masses of the population, but they carry on legal proceedings only in one language—Russian. Even letters and complaints which are received in Kazakh are answered in Russian . . . An end must be put to this inadmissible state of affairs. In this matter the example ought to be set by all soviets, beginning right with the Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh S.S.R. All our laws, all decisions of the local Soviets and their legal processes ought to be transmitted to the masses in two languages.⁶²

Complaints of this sort, particularly those concerning political work, appear particularly in the Baltic press. In January 1958, reporting on the 15th Latvian Communist Party Congress, Sovetskaja Latvija wrote: "In examining the problems of mass political work of party organizations

the delegates observed that this work often suffers because certain decisions concerning the use of the Latvian and Russian languages by our cadres are still poorly carried out."⁶³ And again, "It is necessary to eradicate such cases in which mass political work among the population is not conducted in the native language."⁶⁴

Persistent statements of this sort tend to indicate that Russification is, if anything, too thorough-going precisely in a sphere where the regime would prefer, for the time being, not to witness it. The concept of korenizaciija, or the insistence that the representatives of Soviet power should deal with the masses in the vernacular, is, after all, motivated by a practical regard for the efficiency of communication.

It is easy to see that, particularly in areas where the knowledge of Russian tends to be poor, the failure to use the national languages might be regarded as a cause of alienation, and an all too obvious confirmation that Soviet control is largely a Great Russian affair.

There is little need to continue to suggest more problems than the writer can answer at this point. Nevertheless, it is impossible to dismiss Soviet bilingualism without touching upon one of the most complex and elusive issues in Soviet studies—the question of the role of the non-Russian languages in keeping alive national sentiments. In this regard one comes face to face with a seeming dilemma. On one hand, the regime, through even its limited encouragement of the native languages, undoubtedly has reduced ethnic resentments and provided excellent propaganda capital for display to such emergent multilingual states as India. On the other hand, by this very act of fostering the use of the languages, it may have perpetuated the foci of nationalism and separatism. As both linguists and political scientists have never tired of repeating, history shows that when a people is deprived of all else, language remains as a symbol of solidarity—the ultima Thule of ethnic aspirations.⁶⁵

That the regime is fully aware of this is evidenced by the unrelenting campaign waged in the provincial press against the bogey of "bourgeois nationalism." This Damocles sword must act as a powerful inhibiting force to the intelligentsia of non-Russian areas, who because of the risks involved shun the native language and elect to express themselves in the safer medium of Great Russian.

Everything considered, despite certain advantages derived from it, the continued functioning of such a large number of national tongues, the pressures created by mounting Russification, and the harrassment of the nationalities with the sinister threat of "bourgeois nationalism" all combine to create yet another divisive force—a vulnerability in the "monolithic" fabric of the Soviet system. However, as long as languages are less easily disposed of than rival political parties, the regime can do little more than continue to weight the balance of Soviet bilingualism in favor of Russian.

Postscript on Future Prospects

There is little reason for expecting any radical change in language policy in the predictable future. Minor oscillations and temporary signs of liberalism—often prompted by reasons of grand strategy—will doubtless continue to be noted. For example, since Stalin's death, five of the seven nationalities "liquidated" during World War II and banished to other parts of the Soviet Union have been "rehabilitated." These are the Balkars, Chechens, Ingush, Kalmucks, and the Karačaj, whose languages will, of course, now be restored to official grace. Walter Kolarz sees in this, among other things, a move pro foro externo intended to ingratiate the Soviets with the nations of the East, four of the groups being Islamic and the fifth, the Kalmucks, being Buddhists.⁶⁶

Perhaps as an overture to East and West Germany, the Soviets recently announced the resumption of instruction in German for children of ethnic Germans.⁶⁷ Despite the abuse heaped upon Arabic as a lexical source, the Soviet radio and press recently have announced the introduction of Arabic teaching in ten-year schools in Uzbekistan, and have invited the older generation familiar with Arabic to help youngsters learn this tongue.

No change appears in the offing for Yiddish language and culture, completely liquidated except for its use in the Jewish Autonomous Oblast' of Birobidzhan.

At the same time, the Soviets will undoubtedly continue to promote the languages or dialects of selected small nationalities to the status of literary languages. The latest group to be thus benefited have been the Gagauzy, a Turkic people numbering well below 100,000 and inhabiting the

southern part of the Moldavian S.S.R.⁶⁹ A Cyrillic alphabet has been devised, and Gagauz will be the language of instruction in the first four years of primary school.⁷⁰ Measures like this, while posing no threat to Soviet power, still serve as pro forma evidence of the continuity of "linguistic self-determination and equality."

Of Soviet language policy since 1930, one may well remark: Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose. Nevertheless, the subject of language practices in the multilingual Soviet Union deserves far more attention than it has received both from linguists and social scientists.

Notes

1. Selig S. Harrison, The Most Dangerous Decades: An Introduction to the Comparative Study of Language Policy in Multi-Lingual States (New York: Columbia University Language and Communication Center, 1957), p. i.

2. Uriel Weinreich, Languages in Contact (New York: Linguistic Circle, 1953), p. 3 et passim.

3. Henry Kučera, "Soviet Language Policy," unpublished dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, 1952; see also George Springer, "Soviet Linguistic Theory," unpublished dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, 1954; Henry Kučera, "Soviet Language Policy," Problems of Communism, III (March-April, 1954), 24-29; Uriel Weinreich, "The Russification of Soviet Minority Languages," Problems of Communism, II (1953), 46-57; Alo Raun, "National in Form, Socialist in Content," Ukrainian Quarterly, VI (Spring, 1950).

4. Weinreich, "Russification," pp. 51-52.

5. See Thomas G. Winner, "Problems of Alphabet Reform Among the Turkic Peoples of Soviet Central Asia, 1920-1941," Slavonic and East European Review, XXXVI (1952), 137-147.

6. V. I. Lenin, Izbrannye stat'i po nacional'nomu vo-prosu (Moskva, 1925), p. 39.

7. I. V. Stalin, "O političeskix zadačax Universiteta narodov vostoka," May 18, 1925, Sočinenija (2nd ed., Moskva, 1925), VII, 38-39. For a detailed discussion of the views of Soviet leaders on universal language, see Elliott R. Goodman, "The Soviet Design for a World Language," Russian Review, XV (April 1956), 85-99.

8. I. V. Stalin, "Političeskij otčet Central'nogo komiteta XVI s'ezda VKP(b)," June 27, 1930, Sočinenija, XII, 370.

9. There is an extensive literature on Marr's theories. The most comprehensive single source in a Western language appears to be: L. N. Thomas, The Linguistic Theories of N. Ja. Marr (Berkeley: University of California, 1957), 176 pp.

10. I. V. Stalin, "Otvét Tovarišču A. Xolopovu," July 28, 1950. In Marksizm i voprosy jazykoznanija (Moskva, 1950), pp. 45-47.

11. See John V. Murra et al., The Soviet Linguistic Controversy (New York: King's Crown Press, 1951), 98 pp.

12. A. E. Mordinov, "O razvitii jazykov socialističeskix nacij v SSSR," Voprosy filosofii (No. 3, 1950), pp. 75-93.

13. V. V. Vinogradov, Veliki russkij jazyk (Moskva, 1945), p. 158.

14. A. Mordinov and G. Sanžeev, "Nekotorye voprosy razvitija mladopis'mennyx jazykov SSSR," Bol'shevik, VII (April 1951), 41. Other important statements of this type: A. Mordinov, "O razvitii jazykov socialističeskix narodov," Voprosy filosofii (No. 3, 1950), pp. 77-95; D. Zaslavskij, "Velikij jazyk našej èpoxi," Literaturnaja gazeta, Jan. 1, 1949.

15. V. V. Vinogradov, "Ponjatie vnutrennix zakonov razvitija jazyka," Voprosy jazykoznanija (No. 2, 1952), pp. 3 ff.; R. L'Hermite, "Lois Internes et linguistique soviétique," Linguistics Today, eds. A. Martinet and U. Weinreich (New York: Linguistic Circle, 1954), pp. 69-76.

16. Heinz Kloss, Die Entwicklung neuer germanischer Kultursprachen von 1800 bis 1950 (Munich, 1952).

17. See V. I. Ioxel'son, Kamchadal Studies (in English) (New York Public Library, Manuscript Division, 1910-11); V. I. Ioxel'son, Kamchadal-Russian and Russian-Kamchadal Dictionary (New York Public Library, Manuscript Division, 1910-11); Roman Jakobson, Gerta Hüttl-Worth, and J. F. Beebe, Paleo-Siberian Peoples and Languages, A Bibliographic Guide (New Haven: HRAF Press, 1957), p. 200.

18. Felix Oinas, "Russian Calques in the Balto-Finnic Languages," Indiana Slavic Studies (ed. M. Ginsburg and J. T. Shaw), I (Bloomington, 1956), 225-237.

19. It is realized that this conventional terminology of the traditional "parts of speech" is not well suited for discussions of the numerous non-Indo-European languages of the U.S.S.R. Further refinement is, however, not possible here. Also, as Weinreich was the first to point out, studies of bilingualism should not be done merely against the

perspective of static lists of semantemes but should take into consideration the continuum of flowing, connected spoken and written utterances. See Weinreich, Languages in Contact, p. 33.

20. George Shevelov, "Principi i etapi bol'shevickoj movnoj politiki na Ukraini," Sučasna Ukraina (Munich), June 29, July 13, July 27, 1952. Regarding Russification of Ukrainian, see also: Jaroslav Rudnyčkyj, "Die Lage der Ukrainischen Sprache in der Sowjetunion," Wörter und Sachen, Vol. XIX (1938), No. 4, pp. 284-297; Roman Smal-Stocki, Ukrains'ka mova v sovets'kij Ukraini (Praci Ukrajins'kaho Naukovoho Institutu, XXXIV, Warsaw, 1936); The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishers, 1952), pp. 92-141; Roman Jakobson, "Slavische Sprachfragen in der Sowjetunion," Slavische Rundschau, Vol. VI (1934), No. 5, pp. 324-343; Yaroslav Bilinsky, "Ukrainian Nationalism and Soviet Nationality Policy After World War II," unpublished dissertation, Princeton University, 1958, chapter 6, pp. 251-309.

21. Cited by Ščerbak, "K istorii obrazovanija uzbekskogo nacional'nogo jazyka," Voprosy jazykoznanija (No. 6, 1954), p. 114.

22. "A Correspondent," "Russification of the Tadžik Language," Central Asian Review, VI (1958), 25-33.

23. I. Rasulev, "Nekotorye voprosy uzbekskoj naučno-texničeskoy terminologii," Voprosy Uzbeksckogo jazykoznanija (Tashkent: Ak. Nauk UzSSR, 1954), p. 84.

24. Rasulev, p. 86.

25. Š. I. Mikailov, "Literaturnye jazyki Dagestana," Voprosy jazykoznanija (No. 6, 1955), p. 98.

26. A. S. Sidorov, "Soveščanie po voprosam izučeniya Komi jazyka," Voprosy jazykoznanija (No. 4, 1953), pp. 144-148.

27. N. A. Baskakov, "Razvitie jazykov i pis'mennosti narodov SSSR," Voprosy jazykoznanija (No. 3, 1925), p. 35. Professor Charles A. Ferguson, in a conversation with the writer, pointed out that the influence of Persian on such a language as Uzbek has also contributed to the breakdown of vowel harmony.

28. Sidorov, "Soveščanie."

29. A. Ščerbak, "K istorii obrazovanija uzbekskogo nacional'nogo jazyka," Voprosy jazykoznanija (No. 6, 1954), p. 114.

30. Roman Jakobson, "Sur la théorie des affinités phonologiques entre les langues," in N. S. Troubetzkoy,

Principes de Phonologie (Paris: Klincksieck, 1949), pp. 351-365, esp. 358.

31. Speakers of languages which have no close equivalents for certain Russian phonemes are confronted by an obvious enigma in coping with loan words in their Russian form. Few are the languages, like Mordvinian, in which the Cyrillic alphabet represents the sound system with almost perfect fidelity.

32. H. Kučera, "Soviet Nationality Policy: The Linguistic Controversy," Problems of Communism, II (March-April 1953), pp. 28-29.

33. "Zadači sovětského jazykoznaní v světe trudov I. V. Stalina," Voprosy jazykoznaníja (No. 1, 1952), p. 31.

34. It is typical of enforced programs of language reform that they tend to concentrate on the vocabulary, often to the exclusion of other aspects of a language. Cf., for example, the Turkish experience, as discussed by Uriel Heyd, Language Reform in Turkey (Jerusalem: Israel Oriental Society, 1954), p. 45, et passim.

35. See Alexander Korol, Soviet Education for Science and Technology (Cambridge and New York: Technology Press and John Wiley, 1957), p. 179. See also Vsevelod Holub, "The Language of Instruction: An Aspect of the Problem of Nationalities in the Soviet Union," Horizons (Ukrainian Students' Review) (New York), II (Fall-Spring 1957), 26-37.

36. Pravda Vostoka, Aug. 25, 1956.

37. See "The Teaching of Russian in Central Asian Schools," Central Asian Review, V (1957), 37-41.

38. Kommunist (Erevan), Aug. 21, 1957.

39. Throughout this paper, "bilingualism" is employed in its broadest sense, and is intended to include "multilingualism," which is well represented in the U.S.S.R., particularly in such areas as Dagestan in the Caucasus, or the Xorezm in Uzbekistan.

40. Joseph H. Greenberg, "The Measurement of Linguistic Diversity," Language, XXXII (Jan. - Mar. 1956), 109-115.

41. Uriel Weinreich, "Functional Aspects of Indian Bilingualism," Word, XIII (Aug. 1957), 203-233; 228-229.

42. Karl W. Deutsch, Nationalism and Social Communication (New York, 1953).

43. Einar Huagen, Bilingualism in the Americas (University of Alabama Press, 1956).

44. The term is Weinreich's; see Languages in Contact, p. 98.
45. Bloomfield's use of the terms "dominant" or "upper" and "lower" (Language, [New York, 1933], p. 46) has often been challenged. Weinreich suggests "prestige" language, but points out the contradictions to which all such definitions lead.
46. Richard E. Pipes, "The Nationalities," New Leader, April 14, 1958, p. 17.
47. Bilinsky, "Ukrainian Nationalism," pp. 301-302.
48. Raymond Bauer, Alex Inkeles, Clyde Kluckhohn, How the Soviet System Works (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 202-203. The only large sampling of any one ethnic group in the Harvard study was, however, provided by the Ukrainians, with 458 respondents. A forthcoming report by Yaroslav Bilinsky will analyze more fully the data in these questionnaires.
49. Bauer, Inkeles, p. 202.
50. See Bilinsky, "Ukrainian Nationalism," pp. 251-307, which covers linguistic policy.
51. Bilinsky, "Ukrainian Nationalism," p. 270.
52. Bilinsky, "Ukrainian Nationalism," p. 268a. Bilinsky does not fail to give instances of the operation of the "prestige" factor. He cites an interviewee who informed him that while courting a young Ukrainian lady in Kiev he felt obliged to employ Russian rather than Ukrainian, which would have marked him as a country bumpkin (p. 269).
53. Richard E. Pipes, "Muslims of Central Asia: Trends and Prospects," Middle East Journal, IX, Nos. 2 and 3 (Spring, Summer 1955), pp. 147-162, 295-308; see p. 160 et passim. While Pipes tends to minimize the extent of Russification in Central Asia, these articles contain valuable data on language and nationality problems.
54. Pipes, "Muslims" (Summer, 1955), p. 308.
55. Ministerstvo kul'tury SSSR, Pečat' SSSR za sorok let 1917-1957 (Moskva: Glavizdat, 1957).
56. Pečat', p. 50.
57. Pečat', pp. 50, 72.
58. Pečat', pp. 131-132.
59. An Indo-Iranian language used by a speech community of about 100,000 in the Caucasus. See W. K. Matthews, Languages of the USSR (Cambridge University Press, 1951), p. 127.

60. Pravda, Oct. 20, 1957.

61. Central'noe statističeskoe upravlenie, Kul'turnoe Stroitel'stvo SSSR, (Moskva, 1956), pp. 298-299.

62. Kazaxstanskaja Pravda, Jan. 31, 1957.

63. Sovetskaja Latvija, Jan. 24, 1957.

64. Sovetskaja Latvija, Jan. 23, 1957.

65. No attempt can be made here to discuss the voluminous literature on nationalism which pays attention to the matter of language. Let it be said, *en passant*, that Boyd Shafer's recent work Nationalism: Myth and Reality (New York, 1955) warns against over-emphasis on this phase of the problem: "While language could perhaps be the chief distinguishing mark of nationality, language cannot alone explain the emergence of nationalism" (p. 81 et passim).

66. Walter Kolarz, "Die Rehabilitierung der liquidierten Sowjetvölker," Osteuropa, VI (June 1957).

67. Načalnaja škola, No. 7 (July 1957), p. 79.

68. The Jewish element, numbering about 25,000, appears to constitute only about one-quarter of the population of Birobidžan. No special importance seems to attend the news, printed by the May 28, 1958, Jewish Advocate (Boston) that Radio Moscow's shortwave service had late in May transmitted a broadcast describing life in the Jewish Autonomous Oblast' to North America.

69. P. Jyrkänkallio, "A Survey of the Turkic Peoples of Our Time," Studia Orientalia 14 (Helsinki, 1950), translated from the German and reproduced by the Department of State, Foreign Service Institute, Washington, D. C. (1953), p. 34.

70. Sovetskaja Moldavija, Sept. 26, 1957.

71. Appreciation is expressed for the assistance received in the preparation of this study from the Russian Research Center, Harvard University. Moreover the author is indebted for valuable suggestions to the following: Charles A. Ferguson, Department of Linguistics; Richard E. Pipes, Department of History; Morris Watnick, Russian Research Center, all of Harvard University, and Uriel Weinreich, Department of Linguistics, Columbia University.

THE IMPACT OF RUSSIAN AND WESTERN LITERATURE ON MONGOLIA

By John R. Krueger

Reed College

It will perhaps come as a surprise to Western students of literature that the remote land of Outer Mongolia has a literature at all. The better-informed may know that it consists largely of translated Buddhist works on religion and philosophy, national folklore, and epic tales, and some original historical chronicles dealing with the life and times of Chinggis Qan and the subsequent Mongolian ruling houses.¹

The translation of the Buddhist canon (1720) and its commentary (1749) served to fix the literary language in a rather stylized and conventional mould. This somewhat artificial and archaic form of writings, representing the language as it was spoken even before the time of Chinggis Qan, persisted as the "classical" written language until this century. Later, when Outer Mongolia became the first Soviet satellite in the 1920's, the traditional script was abandoned and a new spelling based on the spoken language was introduced, and written in a Cyrillic alphabet only slightly modified from the Russian.

This, then, was substantially the prevailing situation in the middle of the last century, when the Mongol world (and indeed the whole Orient) was beginning to stir, aroused by progress in the realm of ideas and technology. The Buriat Mongols (to the north of present-day Outer Mongolia, now called the Mongolian People's Republic), were the first to come under Russian influence, colonization, and economic exploitation. It was not long before sons of Buriat noble families were attending Russian gymnasiums and even universities. Gradually, an intelligentsia began to emerge, infused with Western ideas about government and scientific and technical progress. Spearheading this movement at the turn of the century was the young Buriat scholar Cyben Žamearanovič Žamcarano, who had quickly made a name

for himself as a recorder of Mongolian folklore and dialects.²

When Outer Mongolia asserted its independence from China in 1911 following the collapse of the Manchu dynasty, the Russians took advantage of this situation to press for economic and political favors. Korostovetz, then Russian Minister to Urga (now called Ulān Bātor), thought that one way to increase Russian influence was to establish a Mongolian-language school and newspaper. As principal of the school and publisher-editor of the paper, he selected the young Buriat Žamcarano, who in 1913 at once set about putting out the newspaper Šine Toli (The New Mirror).³

In this newspaper, or better, literary journal, Žamcarano published not only news of local and national interest, but informative articles on geography, science, religion, political systems, medicine, and so on. It was directed chiefly at the (largely literate) lamas, but Žamcarano became such an enthusiastic iconoclast that Korostovetz had to muzzle him for fear of disrupting the *status quo*. The incensed monks refused to believe that the world was not flat, or that disease was not caused by evil spirits, and a host of other incredible things.

In addition to this informative material, the pages of Šine Toli contained quite an amount of reading material of some literary merit.⁴ As has been seen, there was no indigenous tradition of belles-lettres. To acquaint his readers and nation with the masterpieces of Western literary expression, nearly every issue of Žamcarano's paper carried a short story by a Western author, or part of a longer work like a novel, translated into Mongolian (generally from an existing Russian translation).

Žamcarano, as the leading intellectual in Outer Mongolia, had a finger in every pie, so to speak. He was, for example, politically active in the cause of Mongolian independence (so much so that it later led to his exile and eventually cost him his life). Still, he found time to translate and publish separately other novels and stories by leading Western authors. Other Mongol intellectuals doing the same included, among others, Rinčen (Elbeg Dorji), Batudalai Očirov, Baradin, Sodnam Dorji, Damdin Sürün. The Buriat Mixail Bogdanov translated much German scientific, artistic, and political literature into Mongolian, while Damba Dorji, former chairman of the Central Committee of the

Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, translated much Marxist-Leninist literature into Mongolian.

Šine Toli itself was rather short-lived—by 1915 it had already been supplanted by another Mongolian periodical, Neyislel küriyen-ü sonin bičig (The Capital City News). Now that the tradition had been begun, it could be carried on in other publications and by other persons. In the next twenty years or so, translations of various works by Boccaccio, Hans Christian Andersen, Robert Louis Stevenson, Guy de Maupassant, and Jonathan Swift appeared.

This matter of translation of Western literature per se was, of course, only part of the general impact of the Western world on the Orient, a fraction of the wholesale borrowing process that went on later. The amount of material thus introduced specifically into Mongolia is quite small, although it reached a class of people influential far out of proportion to its number. This body of translations would undoubtedly have increased as time went on, and could have become an important factor in revitalizing the Mongols, as literature has done in other cultures by giving people insights into other lands, had Soviet pressure been less great. Had young Mongolian writers been given free rein, it might have been possible to observe the influence of this corpus in contemporary fiction.

The great Russian literary figure Maksim Gor'kij recognized the importance of translation and devoted much thought at this time to the problem of what literature to translate. He wrote in 1925 in response to the request of Mongolian writers:

The propagation of the principle of activity would be for your people the most useful thing of all. Active relationship to life is at the bottom of all the marvelous things which Europe possesses and which are worthy of being adopted by all races. Buddha taught that desire is the source of suffering. Europe is ahead of other peoples of the world in the field of science, arts, and technical progress just because she was never afraid of suffering and always desired to improve on what she already had. Europe has been able to stir in the masses of her people the longing for justice and freedom, and for that alone we must forgive her a great number of sins and crimes. I think, in acquainting the Mongolian people with the European spirit and the aspirations of European

masses in our times, you should translate those European books expressing more clearly than others the principle of action.⁵

A good start had been made in translating Western literature, but this trend had to reckon with political forces. In the early 1920's, the government of Outer Mongolia became controlled by Soviet agents and was effectively converted into a Soviet satellite. As a result of this, literature became a function subject to control by the State, and the issuance and publication of works was based not so much on their literary merit as on their political significance and ideological content.

In addition to these external forces operating on Mongolian writers, internal forces arising from the psyche and mentality of the Mongols must also be considered. The Mongols are a nomadic people, living in felt tents, driving their herds over the steppes to pasture, and supplying their wants almost entirely from their animal wealth. Emotionally, they are immature with respect to literature. Steeped as they were (before the Revolution) in the lore of a Buddhist cosmology, usually watered down into mere supernaturalistic animism with vestiges of shamanistic practices, the fantastic and supernatural is commonplace to the Mongol. The villain of his epic literature, for example, is the many-headed monster of superhuman power, the mangyus. The Mongol believes the air, the rocks, and all living beings to be endowed with spirits, and that these are a force in his own life. This is woven into the very fabric of his thinking.

It is not surprising to find that the more fantastic a story was, the better it was liked, and that this was the kind of literature that appealed most to the Mongol. As a result, the works of authors like Jules Verne, H. G. Wells, and Edgar Allen Poe were very popular, as were good adventure stories by various authors, notably Jack London (whose works still enjoy immense popularity in Russia). This is literature, to be sure, but of the sort which in America would be found in the juvenile department of a public library.

Many issues of Šine Toli were taken up with Köke mongyol-un köke tuy (The Blue Banner of the Blue Mongols), a translation of a historical novel by Léon Cahun.⁶ This work is a fast-moving adventure story laid in the days of

Chinggis Qan, filled with knights, battles, and beautiful girls. Another story of Cahun's, La Tueuse, was translated (Mongolian title: Alayači) by Žamcarano but never published.

As many of the new cultural accretions stemmed from Russia, it is only natural that the Mongols also turned to the great classics of Russian literature. Here the same problems arose. Short stories by Čexov, Turgenev, Tolstoj, Puškin, and Gogol' were translated and received with success. It would have been folly, however, to translate the works of Dostoevskij, with their involved psychological overtones. Although Tolstoj's War and Peace was translated into Mongolian, his Anna Karenina was not. A film of the latter work, with Mongolian subtitles, once played in Mongolia, and was a dismal failure, for the audience completely failed to understand it. The position of the Mongols can be likened to that of the Indians in America, who no doubt prefer "Westerns" and "whodunits" to the works of contemporary figures like Hemingway or Faulkner. The new genre of science-fiction would probably be quite popular among the Mongols.

As Soviet regulation of the young state became more complete, the translation of literary works became entirely a tool of propaganda. The translation and publication of the "classics of Communism," the works of Lenin and Stalin, are mainstays for publishing houses in national languages of the U.S.S.R. These and other political works, such as the Short History of the Communist Party and the Communist Manifesto, although they are not belles-lettres, represent nevertheless a considerable percentage of the total output of translated literature. As Walter Kolarz says.

Let us take the impressive number of books published since 1917 in the national languages. . . . These statistics will reflect reality only as soon as we break them up and find out how many books in a given language are simply translations of the works of Lenin and Stalin, of the Short History of the All-Union Communist Party, or propaganda pamphlets, and how many books constitute genuine contribution towards the cultural enrichment of the nationality for which they are printed. There is no doubt that this last figure will be in every case discouragingly small.⁷

In recent years, the bulk of translated works have been by politically reliable Soviet authors. Among those most often mentioned in Soviet works about Mongolia are the following:

Nikolaj Ostrovskij, Kak zakaljalas' stal' (How Steel was Tempered), a story about Soviet youth during the first few years of communist rule;

Aleksandr Fadeev, Molodaja gvardija (The Young Guard), a story of a Komsomol underground organization in the rear of the Nazi Army;

Konstatin Simonov, Russkie ljudi (Russian People), a play about the Russian resistance against the Nazi invaders; and

V. Majakovskij, Stixi o sovetском pasporte (Verses on the Soviet Passport).⁸

The list could be extended, but these examples suffice to show the trend.⁹ Various Soviet sources give figures regarding the number of works translated into Mongolian, including generally books and plays alike, e.g., "between 1925 and 1948, 227 literary works were translated into Mongolian, including 104 works by Soviet authors, 80 by pre-Revolutionary writers and poets, and 43 by authors of all other nations."¹⁰ Another states: "In 1950, about 70 works of Soviet and Russian classical literature were translated into Mongolian."¹¹

Thus can be chronicled the fate of Mongolian literature in recent times. In the brief span of forty years (1915-55), it arose under sponsorship of an intelligentsia, surged and glowed for a while, only to be overwhelmed by totalitarianism. What might have been a noticeable force contributing to presenting the Mongol race with modern ideas lost the battle for men's minds in Mongolia.

Postscriptum

The latest chapter to be written in this history begins in 1956-57, when the first catalogue of Mongolian books appeared in Ulān Bātor, printed in Mongolian.¹² Pages 9-16 of this catalogue are devoted to translations of foreign books (gadaadyn zoxiolčtoj orčuulgyn nomuud). After several pages of works by Marx, Engels, Lenin (but not Stalin), Mao Tse-tung, Chou En-lai, and reports of the Chinese Communist Party, the catalogue goes on to list Dostoevskij's Poor People (Mong. Yaduu xümüüs), Tolstoj's War and Peace

(Mong. Dajn ba enx), and interestingly enough, what appears to be the Lay of Prince Igor's Host (Mong. Igoryn cereglesen tuuĭ). There is also one work each by Lermontov and Čexov, which virtually exhausts the names of pre-Revolutionary Russian authors included. The catalogue continues with works by Soviet authors, but to list or identify them is not our purpose here. There are a few stories (Mong. üliger, "fable") from other cultures, viz. Greek (the story of Jason), an Armenian tale, some Russian tales, and some translations from the Chinese. As these works have all been prepared by the nouveau régime, under strict Communist supervision, they do not hold as much interest for us as the works of the period of roughly 1915-35, discussed above and listed below.

List of Works Translated

N.B. The works are cited by their English titles, where known.¹³ The list stresses the period of approximately 1915-35, and thus does not include works by Russian authors of the Soviet period, nor the so-called "classics of Communism."

A. Translations made by Žamcarano (see Note 2).

1. Author unknown. A History of France. 2 vols.
2. Giovanni Boccaccio. Stories from the Decameron.
3. (David) Léon Cahun: La Bannière bleue (cf. Note 6);¹⁴ La Tueuse (unpublished).
4. Jack London: The Call of the Wild. (This work was so popular that it was often copied out in longhand.)
5. Robert Louis Stevenson: Treasure Island.
6. Lev Tolstoj: Burqan šakiyamuni-yin čadig (apparently a translation of his Zizn' Buddy—Life of Buddha).
7. Jules Verne: A Captain at Fifteen; 20,000 Leagues Under the Sea.
8. H. G. Wells: The War of the Worlds (not finished).

B. Translations of works by Western authors.

1. Aesop. Some fables translated by the Japanese in a propaganda newspaper for children and circulated in Manchuria and Inner Mongolia.
2. Hans Christian Andersen. Some stories translated by Rinčen, 1935.
3. Author unknown. Stories from A Thousand and One Nights, translated by Rinčen, 1935.
4. Author unknown. Literature of Near Eastern

Peoples: Arabian, Armenian and Iranian Stories, translated by Rinčen, 1935.

5. Gottfried Keller. Various stories translated by Rinčen.

6. Guy de Maupassant: La Main.

7. Multatuli [Eduard Douwes Dekker, a Dutch novelist]. Title unknown, translated by Rinčen.

8. Edgar Allen Poe: The Gold Bug, translated (from German) by Načoydorji, 1935.

9. Ernest Thompson Seton: The Springfield Fox (from his Wild Animals I Have Known), translated by Rinčen, 1935.

10. Jonathan Swift: Gulliver's Travels (to Lilliput and Brobdingnab).

11. Jules Verne (as retold by the Russian popular writer Ja. Perel'man): From the Earth to the Moon, translated by Rinčen, 1935.

12. Jacob Wasserman: The Goose Man, translated by Rinčen?

13. H. G. Wells: The Time Machine; The Man Who Could Work Miracles (perhaps only one, or perhaps both).

14. Oscar Wilde: The Picture of Dorian Gray, translated by Rinčen.

C. Translations of works by Russian (pre-Soviet) authors.

1. Anton Čexov: Bez zaglavija; one-act plays; some other stories translated by Rinčen.

2. N. Gogol': The Inspector-General (produced in 1936).

3. A. M. Gor'kij: Xan i ego syn; The Song of the Stormy Petrel; Mother; Moi universitety.

4. I. A. Krylov. Some fables translated by Batu-Dalai Očirov and Erdeni Batu-Xan.

5. M. Ju. Lermontov (poems): The Sail; On the Death of a Poet; Proščaj nemytaja Rossiya.

6. A. S. Puskin: King Saltan; Dubrovsky; The Tales of Belkin. The Shot and The Queen of Spades were translated by Načoydorji. The Captain's Daughter and other stories were translated by Damdin Sürün.

7. Lev Tolstoj: Assarhaddon, King of Assyria (translated by Cyžibov and Rinčen); War and Peace (into Buriat-Mongolian); some short stories (God Sees the Truth But Waits; Karma) were translated by Baradin.

8. I. S. Turgenev. Titles unknown, translated by Damdin Sürün.

Notes

1. The only article of a general nature in English which outlines Mongolian literature seems to be the present

writer's (unsigned) chapter "Artistic and Intellectual Expression," in the Mongolian People's Republic (Outer Mongolia) (New Haven: Human Relations Area Files, 1956), I, 258-285.

The standard work of reference is Berthold Laufer, "Skizze der mongolischen Literature," in Keleti Szemle, VIII (Budapest, 1907), 154-261. An improved edition in Russian, Očerki mongol'skoj literatury, appeared in Leningrad in 1927. Although now outdated, it has not yet been replaced.

2. An outline of this movement and its leading figures is given by Robert A. Rupen, "The Buriat Intelligentsia," in Far Eastern Quarterly, XV (1956), pp. 383-398. By the same author is "Cyben Žamcaranovič Žamcarano", in the Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, XIX (1956), 126-145, which contains a biography of Zamcarano and a bibliography of his writings and translations.

3. Iwan Ja. Korostovetz, Von Cinggis Khan zur Sowjetrepublik (Berlin-Leipzig, 1926), pp. 251 ff.

4. The only issues known to be available in the West are listed by Pentti Aalto, "G. J. Ramstedt's mongolische Bibliothek," Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, LVII, No. 4 (Helsinki, 1954), pp. 1-26, under Items R96a, R96b, R96c.

5. As quoted by Walter Kolarz in The Peoples of the Soviet Far East (London, 1954), p. 152.

6. David Léon Cahun, La Bannière bleue: Aventures d'un musulman, d'un chrétien et d'un païen à l'époque des croisades et de la conquête mongole (Paris, 1877). The translation was made from a Russian version. An English edition is The Blue Banner; or, The Adventures of a Muslim, a Christian, and a Pagan, in the Time of the Crusades and Mongol Conquest, translated by W. Collett Sanders (London, 1878).

7. Walter Kolarz, Russia and her Colonies (London, 1952), p. 27.

8. Walter Kolarz, The Peoples of the Soviet Far East, p. 153.

9. A recent work dealing with the Soviet period of Mongolian literature is: G. I. Mixailov, Očerki istorii sovremennykh mongol'skoj literatury (Moskva, 1955). It also devotes a few pages to the first 600 years of Mongolian literature. The fact that this work does not mention any Western influences is probably due both to the general ideology of Communism and to any effectiveness these translations of Western works may have had in the transmission of ideas.

10. Kolarz, The Peoples of the Soviet Far East, pp. 152 f., citing B. Kameškov, Literatura narodnoj Mongolii, in Zvezda, 1951, No. 9, p. 149.

11. S. S. Demidov, Mongol'skaja narodnaja respublika (Moskva, 1952), p. 53.

12. Mongol nomuud [Mongolian Books], 1956-57, No. 1, 16 pp. It is patterned after the periodical booklet Sovetskie knigi (circulated by the Meždunarodnaja kniga publishing house). It lists both books which have appeared or will shortly appear.

13. Many of the works listed (notably those translated by Rinčen) can be found in the catalogue of the Ramstedt collection (P. Aalto, items R54-R65). A few have been gleaned from various Soviet works on Mongolia. The remainder (notably those by Žamcarano) have kindly been furnished by Professor N. Poppe from memories of his personal acquaintance with these persons and works.

14. Mixailov (p. 171) has harsh words to say about this translation, and calls Žamcarano (though not by name) a "hardened enemy of the Mongolian people." Since Mixailov's book appeared, official policy has apparently rehabilitated Žamcarano, for his name is now being mentioned in recent Soviet works on Mongolian studies.

FOREIGN DRAMA IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY POLISH DRESS

By H. B. Segel

Columbia University

When the Saxon kings occupied the Polish throne in the first half of the eighteenth century, the country suffered one of the most unproductive periods in its cultural history. The "Sarmatian" nobility, in whose hands the cultural life of the nation rested, lived in complete contentment with its material welfare and its institutions. It had lost all artistic taste and the appreciation for higher intellectual issues. In its smug isolation, it remained indifferent to foreign literary currents and produced a literature which reflected only stagnation.

The situation was not much happier in the realm of drama. Up to and including the first half of the eighteenth century, the development of a Polish dramatic literature was weak. The komedia rybałtowska, which marked the beginnings of a true native comedy, died out in the middle of the seventeenth century, largely as a result of the disintegration of the contemporary parochial school system with which it was intimately bound. By the eighteenth century, this very original Polish comedy was quite forgotten, and for the dramatists there seemed no native tradition on which to rely. There was also no public stage, no national theater. Such dramatic presentations as appeared were given for the most part on the estates of nobles, where private theaters were maintained.

In the reign of King Stanisław August Poniatowski (1764-92), a great change took place in the cultural and political life of the nation. A movement for reform was undertaken which was destined to have lasting results. Spearheaded by the National Commission of Education (founded in 1763), and with the stimulus coming largely from abroad, especially from France of the Enlightenment, the attempt was made to unite the Stanislavian age with preceding periods of Polish

cultural grandeur. This meant a return in spirit to the sixteenth century, Poland's Siglo de Oro, when the nation enjoyed a brilliant flowering of Renaissance culture.

All the hereditary ways of thinking and speaking were laid open to criticism and revision by the reformers, and the way began to be paved for a new era of dynamic cultural growth. For literature, the period was one of rebirth to which the whole subsequent culture of Poland is indebted. There was at this time a marked awakening of interest in drama, especially comedy which, in the best eighteenth century tradition, was cultivated because of the possibilities it offered for a corrective influence on the society of the day.

In keeping with this lively interest in drama, a National Theater was founded in the capital city of Warsaw in 1765.¹ This was the first public stage in the history of Poland. From its very inception, however, the National Theater was plagued by financial and administrative difficulties. During the first two years of its existence, from November 1765 to early 1766, some Polish plays were presented. There was not much of a Polish repertory, however. In 1767 the directorship of the theater passed to Karol Tomatis, an Italian, who cared little for a struggling Polish stage and concentrated more on the revenue brought in by foreign troupes (especially French and Italian). The performance of Polish plays virtually ceased at this time.² The situation changed little during the next seven years, until in 1774 the Polish stage was reopened in the Radziwiłł Palace. It remained here until a permanent theater building was erected in 1779.

The problem of a repertory became especially acute now. The need, however, began to be filled by dramatists who followed the practice of adapting foreign works so ingeniously that they rendered them entirely suitable for presentation to Polish audiences. Often highly original in their own way, these adapted works played a vital role in keeping the infant Polish stage alive. In the absence of a native drama, they supplied a much-needed repertory, and also provided a firm base on which an original Polish drama could be—and was—eventually built.

One of the leading dramatists who specialized in such adaptations was Franciszek Zabłocki (1754-1821), a prolific provider of plays for the newly established National Theater.

Although his works were completely devoid of invention in plot and character drawing, Zabłocki was an excellent stylist who had an astonishing intuition for idiom and was capable of giving a play based on a foreign model a completely different atmosphere. He even took plays of second- and third-rate dramatists and, reshaping them, often improved amazingly on their literary value. Romagnesi's Le Petit maître amoureux, for example, was transformed into Fircyk w zalotach (The Dandy A-Wooing, 1781), a comedy glittering with wit and one which gives the impression of being most authentically Polish. In the frame of a borrowed plot, Zabłocki gives an excellent picture of the life and manners of Stanislavian Poland. A more surprising work is Sarmatyzm (Sarmatianism, 1785). The plot and characters are borrowed from the insignificant French comedy, Les Nobles de province, by Hauteroche, a contemporary of Molière. Through Zabłocki's ingenuity, however, it became one of the most famous and influential eighteenth century Polish comedies.

While the works of such a dramatist as Zabłocki attest to the good results obtained by the technique of adaptation employed at the time, the norms of the practice were fixed by one of the most important figures in Poland's eighteenth century Renaissance—Count Adam Kazimierz Czartoryski (1734-1823), the General of Podolia, cousin to the king, and a tireless worker for the Committee of National Education.³ It was Czartoryski who was largely responsible for the intellectual regeneration of Poland in the last three decades of the Commonwealth. Endowed with a passion for learning, eager to promote progress in every field as well as intellectual and artistic activity, Czartoryski was also a writer with an extensive knowledge of world literature, and an inspiring leader among whose pupils could be counted some of the great names of the future Poland.

Czartoryski's entry into Polish theatrical affairs dates from the time when the stage of the Szkoła rycerska or Warsaw Military School (of which he became head in 1764) began to assume under his direction the function of more than just a school stage. By the adapted and translated plays which it presented, it contributed greatly to the continuity of interest in the Polish stage and theater. This was to prove of immense importance when the Polish stage was reborn in the year 1774.

When the Polish stage reopened, Czartoryski was able to take a more direct interest in it than he could from 1765 to 1767, when he was too much occupied with the organization of the Cadets Corps to maintain closest contact. The extent of his interest in drama and theater can be measured not only by the comedies which he wrote for the National Theater, but also by his theoretical writings on drama.⁴ The most important of these is the Preface to his comedy Panna na wydaniu (A Marriageable Miss), which was first presented on the stage of the Warsaw Military School in the year 1770. This became a sort of general handbook on dramatic practice. Aside from reaffirming standard eighteenth century concepts of drama in general and comedy in particular, Czartoryski devotes considerable space to his theory of the adaptation of foreign literary works. After approving of the contemporary practice of using adapted plays as a means of filling the gap in the repertory of the National Theater until the development of a national drama, he then proceeds to lay down a system of rules governing the technique.

An interesting example of the method of adaptation advocated by Czartoryski is his own comedy, Panna na wydaniu. Not only was it in the Preface to this work that Czartoryski established principles for successful adaptation, but it is one of the few eighteenth century Polish comedies that has an English rather than the usual French model. This is not too surprising in Czartoryski's case. As a youth, the Count spent some six years traveling extensively throughout West Europe as part of his education. Especially impressed by the English, he remained an Anglophile the whole of his career. He regarded England as the model of a constitutional monarchy, and wanted Poland to evolve a similar form of government. Czartoryski took the pains to learn English well. He read the English classics in the original, and was familiar with English drama.

Panna na wydaniu is modelled on A Miss In Her Teens or The Medley of Lovers by the well known eighteenth century English actor and dramatist, David Garrick.⁵ The English play, which dates from 1747, is a simple comedy of intrigue. While her true love, Captain Loveit, is away fighting in the campaign in Flanders, the comely Miss Biddy Belair is pursued by a number of suitors. To while away the time and avoid falling into melancholy, she undertakes some

amusing and harmless flirtations. Her most ardent admirers are Fribble, a dandy, and Captain Flash, a deserter from the army. Young Loveit eventually returns from the wars, and quickly disposes of Biddy's suitors. One last obstacle must be overcome, however, before he can claim Biddy as his wife. Aided by Biddy's elderly aunt, and without realizing his son's love for her, Sir Simon Loveit has been seeking Biddy's hand in marriage. In the end the truth is discovered, and the father graciously retires in favor of his son.

In Czartoryski's adaptation, plot structure remains intact. In the Preface to the comedy, the author maintains that the plot of the original must be faithfully reproduced. The only changes permissible were in characterization and setting, in order to render the work accessible to Polish audiences.

Examining Panna na wydaniu first as to setting, it becomes immediately evident that the scene has been shifted from England to Poland. London appears as Warsaw, Berkshire—Różanskie, and Flanders—the Ukraine. Czartoryski was thorough in the localization of setting. In the English original a few place names are mentioned, as stores and inns. Desirous of imparting a more realistic flavor to his work, Czartoryski carries this particularization even further. He mentions not only well known Warsaw stores and inns, but even streets and local landmarks!

It is in characterization, however, that the most significant changes have taken place. Firstly, all the characters have been assigned Polish names. Then, because it was virtually impossible to present before a contemporary Polish audience something as offensive as a father-son love rivalry, the father of young Loveit has been changed to an uncle, Staruszkiewicz. But Czartoryski was not content to stop here. Sarmatianism or cultural backwardness was less a problem in Garrick's England than in Stanislavian Poland. As a member of the reform camp, Czartoryski was committed to its riddance, and seized the character of Staruszkiewicz as a means to attack it in his comedy. The old uncle appears then as a typical Sarmatian. This is immediately apparent in his antiquated ideas concerning the education of women. This issue, and the related question of the role women were to play in the reformed society of Stanislavian Poland, commanded the considerable attention not

only of Czartoryski, but the other leaders of the progressive camp as well. They believed that to women fell the task of bettering man, and that in their society their mission was to refine and polish the manners of the day. A number of Czartoryski's comedies and other writings are devoted especially to this question.⁶

Miss Biddy's two London admirers, Flash and Fribble, were similarly exploited. Garrick had used them to satirize two common London types of his period: the effeminate dandy (Fribble), and the miles gloriosus, the swaggering boaster who is, in reality, a coward (Captain Flash). Because of the differences in Polish and English society, Czartoryski could not accept Garrick's characters without alteration. He changed Fribble into Fircyk, and used him to attack the Gallomania prevalent in late eighteenth century Poland. Fribble was not transformed in the Polish play as radically as Captain Loveit's father. In addition to being a Gallomaniac and what was known at the time in Poland as a polski paryżanin (a Polish Parisian), Fircyk remains an effeminate dandy.

Garrick's miles gloriosus—Captain Flash—underwent more drastic revision than Fribble. Czartoryski was greatly interested in a reform of contemporary Polish judicial and legal practices. A problem of especial concern for him was the education of the young barristers. In addition to a tract he published in Wilno in 1782,⁷ in which he dealt almost exclusively with this problem, Czartoryski also took advantage of the opportunity to express his views still further in Panna na wydaniu. Substituting Swawiański for Flash, he presents a typical poorly educated, poorly prepared barrister who went into law more because of the opportunities it afforded for personal profit than out of any sincere interest. Under little or no surveillance, Swawiański spends more time in gambling and debauchery than in study of the law.

The other characters in the play do not differ greatly from their English models. The heroine, Miss Biddy Belair (Julianna Pięknicka), became more important to Czartoryski's adapted comedy than she was in the original. A representative of the enlightened womanhood of the Stanislavian era, and often a mouthpiece for the author's ideas on the education of women, she joins the contemporary reform society in exposing the Fircyks and Swawiańskis of the day. In

harmony with Czartoryski's typical eighteenth century idea of the functions of drama, by which he understood that in comedy virtue had to receive its just rewards, Julianna must, therefore, reject the two suitors and accept the love proffered her by young Loveit (Rodophil Zalotnicki). Garrick's delightfully drawn servants Puff, Tag, and Jasper have been retained by Czartoryski, but much of their coarser dialogue, which gave a raciness to the original, has been refined to avoid offending contemporary Polish taste.

By a clever manipulation of the English original, Czartoryski was able to develop a work that was not radically different and yet gives the impression of being authentically Polish. The technique of adaptation laid down by Czartoryski and followed successfully by the dramatists of Stanisławian Poland kept the Polish stage alive in one of its most critical periods, and paved the way for the eventual emergence of a more original native drama. This came in the next century, in the rich and unusual theater of the Romantics Mickiewicz, Słowacki, and Krasiński, in the great comedy of Fredro, and in the symbolist plays of Wyspiański.

Notes

1. Excellent source material for the history of the National Theater may be found in Karyna Wierzbicka's Źródła do historii teatru warszawskiego od roku 1762 do roku 1833 (Wrocław, 1955), Vols. I, II.
2. See Wierzbicka, pp. 6-64, "Teatr warszawski pod dyktando Karola Tomatisa w latach 1765-1766," and pp. 64-107, "Teatr warszawski pod dyktando Karola Tomatisa w latach 1766-1767."
3. A good biographical sketch of Czartoryski with critical discussion of his plays and theater work appears in the Introduction to the most recent edition of his comedies. See Adam Kazimierz Czartoryski, Komedie (Warsaw, 1955), pp. 7-63.
4. Czartoryski's plays include: Panna na wydaniu (based on Garrick's A Miss In Her Teens, 1771; Dumny (based on Destouches' Le Glorieux), 1773; Gracz (based on Regnard's Le Joueur), 1775; Bliźnięta (based on Regnard's Les Menechmes), 1775; the more original Mniejszy koncept jak przysługa (1777), Kawa (1779), and the unpublished Koczyk pomarańczowy. His theoretical writings include the Preface and Dedication to the 1771 and 1774 editions of

Panna na wydaniu, the Preface to Kawa, and the "List o dramatyce," which accompanies the 1779 edition of Kawa. For a complete bibliography of Czartoryski's works, see Czartoryski, Komedie, pp. 462-464.

5. For the 1746-47 season, Garrick was engaged to play at Covent Garden. It was at this theater, on January 17, 1747, that A Miss In Her Teens was first presented. The play is not without its foreign source. Garrick himself states that it is founded on Dancourt's La Parisienne (1691).

6. Czartoryski's writings on the education of women and their place in society include the following: Drugi list Jmć Pana Doświadczyńskiego do przyjaciela swego, względem edukacji córek, 1781, and Katechizm moralny dla uczniów Korpusu Kadetów: Definicje różnych cnót towarzyskich i przepisy wewnętrznej karnośći korpusu, 1774. See Komedie, p. 463. In addition to Panna na wydaniu, the comedy Gracz (The Gambler) also contains the author's views on the subject. See especially Reginka's long monologue in Act I, scene 2.

7. List trzeci Doświadczyńskiego (do przyjaciela), zawierający w sobie myśli względem sposobów prowadzenia młodzieży aplikującej się do palestry.

ZDENĚK NĚMEČEK (1894-1957), POET OF CZECH EMIGRANTS

By Beatrice M. Nosco

Columbia University

Czech literature about exiles and emigrants is very poor, or rather, was poor before the work of Zdeněk Němeček. Jaroslav Vrchlický's play Exiles (*Exulanti*, 1886), Alois Jirásek's drama Emigrant (1896) and Teréza Nováková's novel Jan Jílek represent all that Czech literature had to offer in this field, if we disregard Martin Kukučín's writings about Slovak emigrants and Willa Cather's novel My Antonia. Strangely enough this literary theme has not been popular either with Czech writers or Czech readers, although the problem of emigration to avoid persecution is one of the most acute in the Czech history. The writings mentioned above relate to the periods of religious persecution in Bohemia and its consequences. Zdeněk Němeček is the first writer to turn to another kind of emigrants, to those who leave their homeland for the sake of a better life.

Zdeněk Němeček spent most of his life abroad, partly by his own choice, partly involuntarily as a political exile. On his return from World War I, he became an official in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Prague and as a diplomat he lived nearly for thirty years in France, Spain, Denmark, and the United States.

During his stay in New York, he came in contact for the first time with the tragedies of individual Czech emigrants, and became deeply disturbed by the whole problem of emigration. It was his conviction that to emigrate always means tragedy and that the price to be paid is not worth the material comfort which may be secured. Out of this experience came his book New York: Foggy (New York: zamlženo, 1929), his first novel, but nevertheless his best and most profound book. Needless to say the story he tells is a tragic one, and the tragedy culminates in the fact that not too many years later, Zdeněk Němeček himself

wandered on the streets of New York as an exile without home or work.

He returned to the problem of emigration in his novel West from Pannonia (Na západ od Pannonie, 1935) and in a drama—considerably weaker than his novels—What Is Human Life Worth (Zač lidský život, 1936). Here the heroes are emigrant miners in France. He calls them Pannonians, because they were of mixed Slavic origin. New York: Foggy was written by a man saddened by a complex problem, West from Pannonia by an angry man, outraged by the French exploitation and inhuman treatment of the immigrant miners. Alcohol was their only joy, and love—if unhappy—was a reason for murder. Czech literary critics hailed Němeček's emigrant novels as convincing documentaries and nominated him as candidate for the State Literary Prize; which he received in 1935.

There is, however, another reason why Němeček's books have a prominent place in the history of modern Czech literature: their ethical value. Emigration was only one of the problems which concerned him, even if the greatest one. The problem of war, political persecution, the relativity of truth, evil and God himself are often discussed in his writings. War for him is (in Tales of the Legion—Legionářské povídky, 1920) "a great evil for a great good ... there are no human beings I would hate ... I have been fighting for the two years now, I am only trying to help to destroy an immoral system ... when I am shooting, I lock my conscience under five locks ..."

Although a pacifist, he knew that political persecution—an alternative way of settling political differences without open conflict—was also a great evil, and he was worried about its consequences, for during the time of persecution the best and most honest individuals perish, while the wicked remain to found a new generation. In his travel book Letters from Senegambia (Dopise ze Senegambie, 1938), he comes to an interesting conclusion: "Today a new minority have appeared in this world. A minority of people who are in jail (for political reasons). What is done for their rescue? A mass Good Friday of all humanity. From this jail on the Canary Islands across all Europe and Asia—a political prison of two camps into which the white and partly even the yellow races have changed. What here is a crime, ten steps farther over the border is considered good. And vice versa.

And thus, from a higher standpoint, everything is violence. It is interesting that only the people who are careful, those without a backbone, or even amphibious hypocrites are saved from this terror, only they flourish richly under both the white and the red dictatorship. They are here to preserve the race."

Zdeněk Němeček was fundamentally an ethical thinker, for whom the esthetic quality of writing was only a by-product. Each of his books was inspired by a deep experience. It had to be written; it was intended to give a shock to the conscience of the reader. He admitted that he was a pragmatist and that he was influenced in philosophy by James, Kierkegaard, and Masaryk, in art by Thomas Wolfe and Griboedov. He is, however, unique and Czech in his realism, in his search for truth and in his hopeless realization that each one of us has only a piece of truth of his own, and thus the root of all misunderstandings and wars can never be removed. His relativism is profoundly elaborated in his novel The Devil Speaks Spanish (Ďábel mluví španělsky, 1939—the second of Němeček's books awarded the State Literary Prize): "Throw light upon a man from above, from the side, from below, and you will get three truths, three images, three lies..." In this book he introduces us to authentic witnesses and questions them about one and the same thing: the purpose and the idea of the Spanish Civil War. In answer he receives replies which contrast so sharply to one another that there is only one conclusion to be drawn: they all are convinced they are fighting for the truth—but actually each of them is fighting for a personal conception of truth and right, without the real truth ever being revealed to him. In Fan from the Meridians (Vějíř z poledníků, 1937) Němeček adds: "... morals and morality have only relative dimensions ..."

It seemed to him that people are both innocently and intentionally wounded by blindness, by inability to learn the truth, and thus they fight an unequal fight with an unknown force that for them only approaches the truth. When humanity reaches out its hand for truth, it loses it, and thus there is no end to this Tantalus-like torture.

In many places Zdeněk Němeček confesses his negative attitude to whatever higher power may direct the course of our lives, and which, according to his experience, is so incredibly cruel that human beings have to defend themselves

against its absurd justice. He was not so much concerned with the results or effects of evil, as with its root, God himself. He was impressed by the sincerity of the Russian Orthodox Church, by the tragic mystery of the Jewish religion, but he himself—although a Protestant—did not find peace in any religion. His anger over the sadistic cruelty of fate which he observed about him could not be pacified by any dogma. About Chodos (his most autobiographic hero), he says in New York: Foggy: "Chodos lost his old faith. All the principles and truths of the Talmud were wrecked long ago on the rocks of life. Skepticism, wild as a tornado, flew a few times across his path, leaving there nothing but desert. Instead of turning to God, as people who are aged do, the very opposite dominated his soul . . . he lost all trust in the morality of the human universe, and, long before that, he had finished his fight with God's justice."

Dr. Adamíra gives a similar explanation of why he defended his friend, in Němeček's novel European Cantilena (*Evropská kantiléna*, 1946): "Why? Why do I defend him? I do not know. Inside me is the revolt against the attacks of fate and of the so-called higher power." No less gloomy is the conclusion to which Němeček comes in last travel book Letters from Iceland (*Islandské listy*, 1948). He observed two mountain creeks, one crystal clear, one muddy, as they unite in the valley in a single dirty stream. This moves him to a symbolic consideration of the problem of the relationship of good and evil and he concludes: "Somewhere there unite two rivers of different origin: one runs down from a clear glacier, the other from a mountain spring. And remember, it is always the dirty river which is victorious, representing thus for me the principle of evil. Evil wins."

It is over a year now since the death of Zdeněk Němeček, the only poet of Czech emigrants. He passed away without having his last and only wish fulfilled: to die at home. He died abroad, suddenly, like Chodos in New York: Foggy: "The curve of the sad life of a man who had never done any harm to anybody was cut off by a mysterious power as cynically as though its whole orbit were distorted." Or was it? Perhaps it was the only touch of that mercy for which Němeček searched in vain while he was still among us.

FOREIGN BORROWINGS IN RUSSIAN

By Gerta Hüttl Worth

University of California (Los Angeles)

About one-fourth of the Russian literary vocabulary consists of foreign words.¹ They entered the Russian language at all stages of its development and thus reflect the history of the people—with precisely which nations the East Slavs came in close contact and in which spheres they were most influenced by these nations. The history of this large portion of the vocabulary has nevertheless been explored very little.

The most recent publications that contain foreign words in abundance are the Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka² and Vasmer's Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.³ The Slovar', although very voluminous, throws but little light on the history of foreign words, since it gives quotations previous to the nineteenth century only in exceptional cases; it does not indicate at all the route by which they came into Russian, but only the original source (such as Greek or Latin).

The importance and merits of Vasmer's etymological dictionary have been evaluated in many reviews. Vasmer has been praised as the first to include all borrowings, regardless of the period in which they came into Russian. Well over half of Vasmer's dictionary consists of foreign words (app. 6300 of 11,600). For each word Vasmer gives an up-to-date summary of the already existing literature dealing with the original source of the word. Vasmer's own contribution consists in many cases of a description of the particular route by which the word penetrated into Russian and the date of its first appearance there. This information is often not accurate, though Vasmer makes definite remarks like "used for the first time," or "already introduced by Prokopovič," etc.

Vasmer's information seems reliable for the older period, for example for the borrowings from Greek; it is

based on his own monographs and on Sreznevskij.⁴ The following period contains many gaps of which Vasmer himself is fully aware; he mentions, in the Epilogue to his dictionary, that our knowledge of the Russian vocabulary of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is particularly insufficient. The borrowings of the time of Peter the Great are recorded mostly according to N. A. Smirnov's dictionary, Zapadnoe vlijanie na rusckij jazyk v Petrovskuju èpoxu.⁵ The great mass of foreign words borrowed from the eighteenth to the twentieth century are usually given without reference to the time of their appearance in Russian.

My research in the history of the Russian vocabulary has brought to light a good deal of information which supplements or corrects that of Vasmer, particularly concerning the dating and routes of penetration of foreign words in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

A considerable number of words quoted by Vasmer as borrowings of the Petrinic epoch and cited in Smirnov were already used in East Slavic decades before Peter. Smirnov's dictionary contains words used at the time of Peter the Great, but not necessarily only new words of that time. Smirnov mentions in the Foreword to his dictionary the impossibility of stating with certainty whether these words were used previously or not and quotes 24 terms from his dictionary that were already known in the seventeenth century. On the other hand, Smirnov excerpted only 29 sources and his dictionary includes, consequently, only a sampling of the borrowings actually in use.

From words considered as "Petrinic borrowings" by Vasmer, I have found some hundred in prior sources, in glossaries like the Azbukovnik o neudob' poznavаемyx rečax,⁶ from the sixteenth or seventeenth century, in a French-Russian glossary of 1586,⁷ in the dictionaries of Berynda,⁸ Zizanj,⁹ and in one edited by Žiteckij.¹⁰ They occur in the most varied texts of the seventeenth century, for example in the dramas written or translated under Aleksej Mixajlovič,¹¹ in the works of Simeon Polockij,¹² not to speak of the travel reports of the Russian poslanniki.¹³ A part of the sources mentioned are, of course, not written in Russian, but in a complex mixture of Ukrainian, Belorussian, Church Slavonic, and Polish elements (the latter including Latin borrowings and Germanisms) that all together constituted Ruthenian, the literary language of the

Jugozapadnaja Rus' of that time,¹⁴ which exerted great influence on Moscow, especially in the second half of the seventeenth century. One may assume that, in the question of dating foreign words, their occurrence in the texts of Polockij, for instance, indicates that these words had penetrated into Russian decades prior to Peter. It seems very likely that foreign words quoted by Berynda were used in Russian in the seventeenth century and did not reappear as new borrowings from the West fifty years later. A proof is that many foreign words occur not only in one of the quoted dictionaries, but in two or three, like apteka, affekt, konstytucija, košt,¹⁵ or also in seventeenth century texts, as karta, million, sekretar',¹⁶ or they occur with the same explanations, both in the seventeenth century and in Petrinic texts, for example affekt—strast', materija—veščestvo, port—pristanišče.¹⁷ The continuity of the vocabulary is reflected in the dictionaries whose writers were well acquainted with previous similar publications. They repeat in part the same foreign words and explanations and even retell the same fantastic stories connected with exotic names for animals and the like, about the bird Nejasyt',¹⁸ or the legendary grif.¹⁹

The dating of these foreign borrowings prior to Peter sometimes makes it necessary to revise Vasmer's indications about their route into Russian. For instance, words considered by Vasmer as eighteenth century borrowings directly from French can be shown to have existed already in seventeenth century Russian, when there was practically no direct French cultural influence; this means that such words were in all probability taken either directly from Latin and Greek into Russian, or first into German and Polish, from which they slipped into Jugozapadnaja Rus', and thence into Russian, instead of passing from the classical languages into Western Europe and from there directly into Russian. For instance, Vasmer (I, 31) considers astronom as borrowed via French or German. However, we find this word in the above-mentioned Azbukovnik and in Berynda's dictionary, and therefore direct borrowing from French can be excluded. The same can be said for pelikan, since Lavrentij Zizanij (p. 128) quotes it in 1596: "Nejasyt', po Grecu pelekan, ptax est' v Egipte." Or, Vasmer (I, 490), supposes that the words istorik and istorija were borrowed via German at Peter's time. But Sreznevskij (I, 1151) cites

these words in translations from Greek between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries; thus they were taken directly from Greek. Nor can one consider that these terms disappeared and were then reintroduced in Peter's time, since they were used in the seventeenth century (see Berynda, p. 47; Azbu-kovnik, p. 161, Polockij, p. 111). In the case of xina 'quinine' German can be excluded, despite Vasmer (III, 241), because this word appears in Russian in 1719 in a book by Kantemir:²⁰ "ruki i nogi Kinoju, to est' Xinoju krasiti," while German China, Chinarinde has been used only since 1801 (Vasmer, III, 241).

It may be interesting, not only for historical lexicology, but also for cultural history, that the Russians got acquainted with many more Western concepts than is usually assumed before the opening of the "window into Europe." Certain foreign ranks or titles, for instance, were not used for the first time when Peter adopted them officially for Russia, but decades or even centuries earlier, when Russians came across them abroad. So we find admiral in a diplomatic report of 1567 about Sweden: byl u poslov ot korolja Petr Bag, ammaral;²¹ this form without d was taken from Swedish Ammoral, Amiral attested in the sixteenth century; all forms with d go back to French admiral, with secondary d from admirer; the original source is Arabic. In a Statejnyj spisok of 1582 about England, knjaz' admiral occurs twice for "Lord high admiral"²² and in 1600 we find a Russian derivative: admiralov syn. The word baron also occurs in 1600.²³ In a diplomatic report about France of 1667 we find general-poručik for lieutenant-général, prezident for président and kapitan gvardii.²⁴

These words attested prior to Peter are mostly administrative, scientific, and military terms. This distribution corresponds to that given by Smirnov with one exception: among the borrowings prior to Peter there are only two nautical terms, barka and port,²⁵ while about a fourth of the words quoted by Smirnov are nautical terms. This may be conditioned by the choice of texts, but it does not explain their absence from prePetrinic dictionaries. One can assume that further investigations of seventeenth century texts will find more borrowings prior to Peter's time.

First references can be given for about 250 words mentioned by Vasmer without any date, mostly from texts and dictionaries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, for

instance, geografija, vaza, loža, nerv.²⁶ This dating, however, can in many cases be only preliminary, because only a restricted selection of sources was investigated and an exhaustive study would be necessary in order to come to definitive results. Sometimes the passages in which foreign words occur indicate that they were newly or fairly recently introduced: when they are accompanied by explanations, equivalents in Russians, or by the foreign word in the original writing, or when printed in italics. When Karamzin, for instance, introduces the English word "spleen," he adds in a footnote: "to est' melanxolija," the second time: "voj anglijskij splin! Ėtu npravstvennuju bolezn' možno nazvat' i russkim imenem skukoju." In the same passage we find "Rost-bif, bifsteks est' ix obyknovennaja pišča." Both term terms are italicized and explained in a footnote: "žarenaja i bitaja govjadina."²⁷

Here and there paraphrases given by contemporary dictionaries in the place of foreign words serve as indirect proof that the foreign expression itself had not yet been accepted into Russian. The Russian-English dictionary of 1784, for example, still gives for egotism: 'jakan'e, častoe o sebe govoren'e,' or for pudding: 'varenoj pirog, delaemyj v Anglii.'²⁸

Vasmer's haphazard quotations from nineteenth century literature can often be replaced by earlier ones from writers and dictionaries of the preceding centuries. For example roman 'novel, romantic adventure' was used by Lomonosov, Sumarokov, Novikov, and Karamzin; kunak "friend, host" occurs in a Statejnyj spisok about Georgia of 1639: "otпустите ... xolopej, a moix kunakov."²⁹

Particularly scanty is our knowledge of oriental borrowings, among other things even the approximate time of their appearance in Russian. One cannot consult Smirnov for them, because he treats only Western borrowings. First references for more than thirty oriental words were found in travel reports of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries³⁰ and especially in the translation of Dmitrij Kante-mir's treatise of 1719 about the Mohammedan religion.³¹ These texts contain, interestingly enough, some oriental words, whose spellings which renders very closely their original phonetic form, indicates that these words were borrowed directly from oriental sources, for instance, minare from Osmanli minarä. However, in modern Russian, their

spelling is closer to that of French or German, for example, minaret. Vasmer therefore assumes these words were borrowed via West European languages. I consider it likely that these words were first borrowed directly and that then, in the eighteenth or nineteenth century, their spelling was assimilated to that of French or German. The best example is turban that Vasmer (III, 154) considers as borrowed via German, whereas tjurban was taken from French (III, 164). But Kantemir uses tulband and tulipan that are much closer to Osmanli tülbend: "glavu černym tulbandom pokryvaše" (p. 8), "šapki, vmesto Tulipana" (p. 322). Vasmer presumes that derviš is a new Western borrowing, replacing derbyš used in the sixteenth century. However, we find in a Statejnyj spisok of 1570 about Turkey: U ... saltana astoroxanskoj Derviš, Aleev syn.³² Šejx, Šejk is supposed to be borrowed via German or French; however we find in Afanasij Nikitin (sixteenth century): "na pamjati šixa Aladina."³³ Kantemir frequently uses šeix, šeixstvo. Garem is, according to Vasmer (I, 259), taken from French, because of the initial g, but in Kantemir (p. 196) we find: vnitie v xarem.

It is to be noted that one could find without any difficulty a great number of foreign words in seventeenth and eighteenth century Russian that are not quoted by Vasmer and that still exist in modern Russian, for instance, avanscena, apofeož, argus, gallicism.³⁴

As one sees, our knowledge of foreign words is still rather vague. One of the many unsolved tasks of Russian historical lexicology is to establish for all such borrowings their sources, their exact route of penetration and when they first appeared in Russian. Such facts are already well known for other European languages.

Notes

1. An earlier version of this article was read at the Slavic Linguistic Section of the Modern Language Association, on December 29, 1958; it is an extract from a larger work in progress.

2. Of which seven volumes have appeared to date (Moskva: Akademija Nauk SSSR, 1950-58).

3. Three vols., Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1950-58.

4. M. Vasmer, Greko-slavjanske štjudy (SPb., 1909 = Sbornik Otdel. russk. jazyka i slovesn., Vol. 86); I. Sreznevskij, Materialy dlja slovarja drevne-russkogo jazyka (3 vols., SPb., 1893).

5. = Sbornik Otdel. russk. jazyka i slovesn., Vol. 88, No. 2 (SPb., 1910).

6. In I. Saxarov, Skazanija russkogo naroda (SPb., 1849), II, 135-191: advokat, aptekar', bazis, burmistr 'bailiff,' imperator, kodeks, konsul, monstr.

7. Paul Boyer, ed., Un vocabulaire français-russe de la fin du XVIe siècle (Paris, 1905): aptekar', karta.

8. Pamva Berynda, Leksikon slavenorosskij, in Saxarov, II, 5-118; konfekty, kopija, kreditor, lekcija, litera, mezerne, tribunal.

9. Lavrentij Zizanij, Leksis sireč rečeniya ... iz Slovenskago jazyka na prostyj Ruskij dialekt, in Saxarov, II, 121-134: e.g., million, palac, pelikan, fortuna.

10. P. Žiteckij, Slovar' malorusskoj reči po rukopisi XVII veka (Kiev, 1888): e.g., affekt, policija, geometrija, žolner.

11. E.g., in Aleksej, božij čelovek (1673), in N. Tixonravov, Russkie dramatičeskie proizvedeniya 1672-1725 (SPb., 1874), I, 3-75: e.g., kandidat, kost, musiti, patron, paštet, prolog.

12. Simeon Polockij, Izbrannye sočineniya (M.-L., 1953): e.g., featr (teatr), tip, fron (tron), monarx.

13. E.g., in P. I. Potemkin, "Statejnyj spisok," in Putešestvija russkix poslov XVI-XVII vv. (M.-L., 1954), pp. 227-315: barka, gvardija, podskarbej, milja, litera, kljaštor, štuka, etc.

14. This use of the term "Ruthenian" has been proposed by Prof. G. Shevelov.

15. More examples: diftong, dogma, doktor, zefir, konstitucija, leopard, mitra, palac, posessija, prosodija.

16. The following words occur in Berynda's dictionary and in the seventeenth century texts already mentioned: nafta (Polockij), para (Potemkin), pelgrim (Aleksej, božij čelovek), senator (*ibid.*), sekretar' (Potemkin), student (*ibid.*), triumf (Polockij).

17. All from the dictionaries by Berynda and Smirnov.

18. Cf. Zizanij, p. 128, and Azbukovnik, p. 173.

19. Cf. Azbukovnik, p. 153, Berynda, p. 65.

20. Dmitrij Kantemir, Knigi sistima ili sostojanie

muxammedanskija religii (SPb., 1722). Translation from Latin by Il'inskij. Henceforth cited as Kantemir.

21. I. M. Voroncov, "Statejnyj spisok," in Putešestvija, p. 40.
22. F. A. Pisemskij, "Statejnyj spisok," in Putešestvija, p. 114.
23. G. I. Mikulin, "Statejnyj spisok," in Putešestvija, p. 200.
24. P. I. Potemkin, pp. 227, 243, 239.
25. Barka 'korabl' ili ladija, 'Azbukovnik, p. 147; pristanisce 'port, 'Berynda, p. 83.
26. E.g., in seventeenth century sources: (a) in Berynda: geografija, gimn, lampa, taler, terpentin (terpetina); in Potemkin: granat 'pomegranat, 'dulja, markiz (markez). In eighteenth century sources, e.g., in N. M. Karamzin, Pis'ma russkogo putešestvennika (1791-92): abbat, aplodi-rovat', afiša, barel'ef, biskvit, bjust, vaza, virtuoz, gletšer, gobelen, grot, gruppa, etc.
27. N. M. Karamzin, op. cit., in Russkaja proza XVIII veka (M.-L., 1950), II, 524.
28. Proxor Ždanov, A New Dictionary English and Russian (SPb., 1784).
29. F. Elčin, "Statejnyj spisok," in Putešestvija, p. 224.
30. E.g., in I. P. Novosil'cev, "Statejnyj spisok" (1570, about Turkey), in Putešestvija, pp. 63-99: aga, kadyj, mufti, tjušak, čekus; in F. Elčin, esyr', kunak, ščerba.
31. In Kantemir: baxčis, garem, Divan, imam, ramazan, surguč, čubuk, emir (but OR amir), effendi, etc.
32. I. P. Novosil'cev, p. 89 (but OR derbyš).
33. In Onorskij and Barxudarov, Xrestomatija po istorii russkogo jazyka, I, 233; šeix, Kantemir, pp. 33, 36, 189, 291, etc.
34. All from Karamzin, op. cit.; words occurring in the seventeenth century: e.g., Amazonka, ambrozija, antracit, daktil', spondej, stoik (all from Azbukovnik).

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL INFORMATION CENTER ON THE STATUS OF RUSSIAN IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Preliminary tabulations, September to December 1958

By Fan Parker

Since October 1957, when the launching of Soviet Sputnik I startled the world, there has been a marked increase in American concern over the teaching of Russian in the American secondary school. As instruction in Russian on this level developed, the need became manifest for dependable information on the number of secondary schools offering Russian language courses, and their student enrollments. In May 1958, the Modern Language Association of America, with the support of the Rockefeller Foundation, called a conference of Russian language specialists "to take stock of the current status of interest in teaching Russian in American secondary schools and to identify and discuss some of the problems which will be encountered in any effort to expand Russian instruction at that level." Subsequent to that conference, and with the encouragement of the Modern Language Association of America and the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, the National Information Center on the Status of Russian in Secondary Schools was established at Brooklyn College, under the directorship of Fan Parker, in May 1958, to deal with the problem. The establishment of the Center was made possible through the co-operation of the President of Brooklyn College, Dr. Harry D. Gideonse. He allocated an office, provided clerical help, and supplied necessary office equipment. In addition, a small financial grant was given to the National Information Center to enable it to proceed with the national survey.

The research methods of the National Information Center include:

(1) Preliminary State Questionnaires.

On August 25, 1958, questionnaires and explanatory letters were sent to the commissioners of education in each of the forty-nine states. To date, only three states (Arkansas, Missouri, and Montana) have not responded. The other forty-six states have responded; some sent completed questionnaires, some suggested other sources, and some admitted ignorance on the subject.

(2) Letters.

Leading educators were asked to forward pertinent data they might have to the National Information Center. Their contributions have often provided detailed information not supplied by state sources.

(3) Publicity.

Releases concerning the survey of the National Information Center submitted to scholarly journals by the Modern Language Association of America have led to the voluntary contributions by educators of information about their own junior and senior high school Russian courses.

(4) City and County Questionnaires.

The National Information Center can only hope, in its present financial situation, to contact some of the county superintendents of education. (The Education Directory, 1957-1958, Part II, is being consulted.)

(5) Local Boards of Education.

The National Information Center has found that detailed information is difficult to ferret out without the help of local officials. The decentralized educational system peculiar to America has enabled local school boards to initiate Russian courses without the knowledge of their state commissioners. Therefore, the fourth phase of the Nation Information Center's statistical survey leads to the next logical and necessary step of communication with local boards of education.

The research system outlined above should permit the National Information Center to provide accurate statistics. After only a few months of operation, from September to December 1958, the Center is shedding light on a subject on which previously very incomplete information was available.

TABLE I

States Whose Commissioners Of Education Indicated That To Their Knowledge No Russian Language Courses Were Being Offered In The Curricula Of Their Schools:

Alabama	Maryland	Texas
Arizona	North Carolina	Vermont
Idaho	North Dakota	Virginia
Louisiana	Oklahoma	West Virginia
Maine	Tennessee	Wyoming

States Whose Commissioners Of Education Indicated That To Their Knowledge Information About Russian Language Courses Was Not Available At Present:

Florida	Kentucky	Nevada
Iowa	Mississippi	South Carolina

TABLE II

PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN WHICH RUSSIAN WAS
OFFERED: September to December, 1958
(As tabulated by the National Information Center)

Alaska—1 school

Anchorage Independent School District, Anchorage, Alaska

California—22 schools

Polytechnic High School, San Francisco, California
Delano Junior High School, Delano, California
Grossmont Union High School, Grossmont, California
Sonoma Valley Union High School, Sonoma, California
Arcadia High School, Arcadia, California
Culver City High School, Culver City, California
Fresno Unified School District, Fresno, California
Fremont High School, Sunnyvale, California
Kern County Union High School, Bakersfield, California
Piedmont High School, Piedmont, California
Riverside High School, Riverside, California
Lincoln High School, San Francisco, California
Shasta High School, Redding, California
Whittier High School, Whittier, California
Acalenes High School, Lafayette, California
Fremont Union High School, San Jose, California
Novato High School, Novato, California
Pasadena High School, Pasadena, California
Salina High School, Salina, California
San Leandro High School, San Leandro, California
San Diego High School, San Diego, California
C. K. McClatchy Senior High School, Sacramento, California

Colorado—2 schools

Jefferson County District Schools, Lakewood, Colorado
Boulder Public Schools, Boulder, Colorado

Connecticut—8 schools

Norwich Free Academy, Norwich, Connecticut
Stamford High School, Stamford, Connecticut
Andrew Warde High School, Fairfield, Connecticut
Glastonbury High School, Glastonbury, Connecticut
Westminster School, Simsbury, Connecticut
New Britain High School, New Britain, Connecticut
Southbury High School, Southbury, Connecticut
Waterford High School, Waterford, Connecticut

Delaware—1 school

Newark High School, Newark, Delaware

Georgia—2 schools

DeKalb County System, Decatur, Georgia
Atlanta Public School System, Atlanta, Georgia

Illinois—4 schools

Arlington High School, Arlington Heights, Illinois
Gordon Technical High School, Chicago, Illinois

Illinois—cont.

Proviso High School, Maywood, Illinois
Central Day & Evening High School, Chicago, Illinois

Indiana—1 school

North Central High School, Indianapolis, Indiana

Kansas—3 schools

Wichita East High School, Wichita, Kansas
Lawrence High School, Lawrence, Kansas
Shawnee Mission High School, Merriam, Kansas

Massachusetts—5 schools

Concord High School, Concord, Massachusetts
Fall River High School, Fall River, Massachusetts
Hopkinton High School, Hopkinton, Massachusetts
Newton High School, Newton, Massachusetts
Weston High School, Weston, Massachusetts

Michigan—11 schools

Ann Arbor High School, Ann Arbor, Michigan
Mackenzie High School, Detroit, Michigan
Redford High School, Detroit, Michigan
Cody High School, Detroit, Michigan
Southeastern High School, Detroit, Michigan
Denby High School, Detroit, Michigan
Pershing High School, Detroit, Michigan
Osborn High School, Detroit, Michigan
Central High School, Detroit, Michigan
Ford High School, Detroit, Michigan
Mumford High School, Detroit, Michigan

Minnesota—3 schools

University High School, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Roosevelt High School, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Washburn High School, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Montana—1 school

Helena High School, Helena, Montana

Nebraska—1 school

Central High School, Omaha, Nebraska

New Hampshire—1 school

St. Paul's School, Concord, New Hampshire

New Jersey—3 schools

Thomas Jefferson Junior High School, Fair Lawn, New Jersey
Memorial Junior High School, Fair Lawn, New Jersey
Pascack Valley Regional High School, Hillsdale, New Jersey

New Mexico—4 schools

Los Alamos High School, Los Alamos, New Mexico
Espanola High School, Espanola, New Mexico
Santa Fe High School, Santa Fe, New Mexico
Albuquerque High School, Albuquerque, New Mexico

New York—10 schools

Long Beach High School, Long Beach, New York

New York—cont.

Stuyvesant High School, New York, New York
Charles E. Hughes High School, New York, New York
Baldwin Senior High School, Baldwin, New York
Benjamin Junior High School 64, Brooklyn, New York
Ichabod Crane Central High School, Valatie, New York
Uniondale High School, Uniondale, New York
Hewlett High School, Hewlett, New York
Servan Lakol High School, Floral Park, New York
Port Washington High School, Port Washington, New York

Ohio—7 schools

Hamilton High School, Hamilton, Ohio
Kent State Union School, Kent, Ohio
Toledo High School, Toledo, Ohio
Parma Senior High School, Parma, Ohio
Mad River Township High School, Mad River, Ohio
Fairmont High School, Fairmont, Ohio
Kettering High School, Kettering, Ohio

Oregon—5 schools

Cleveland High School, Portland, Oregon
Madison High School, Portland, Oregon
Franklin High School, Portland, Oregon
Washington High School, Portland, Oregon
Roosevelt High School, Portland, Oregon

Pennsylvania—3 schools

Boyertown Area High School, Boyertown, Pennsylvania
Allentown High School, Allentown, Pennsylvania
Aliquippa High School, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania

Rhode Island—1 school

Granston High School, Granston, Rhode Island

South Dakota—1 school

Huron City Schools, Huron, South Dakota

Utah—1 school

Davis High School, Kaysville, Utah

Washington—9 schools

Brewster High School, Brewster, Washington
Roosevelt High School, Seattle, Washington
Ballard High School, Seattle, Washington
Garfield High School, Seattle, Washington
Chief Joseph Junior High School, Richland, Washington
Stadium High School, Tacoma, Washington
Bellevue Senior High School, Bellevue, Washington
Highline High School, Seattle, Washington
Columbia High School, Richland, Washington

Wisconsin—4 schools

Nicolet High School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
St. Catherine's High School, Racine, Wisconsin
Wisconsin High School, Madison, Wisconsin
Madison West High School, Madison, Wisconsin

TABLE III

PRIVATE SCHOOLS NOW OFFERING COURSES IN RUSSIAN

(List compiled by the Informal Committee on Russian of the
Secondary Education Board, Claire Walker, Chairman)

California—3 schools

Chadwick School, Rolling Hills, California
Crystal Springs School for Girls, Hillsborough, California
Menlo School, Menlo Park, California

Connecticut—1 school

Choate School, Wallingford, Connecticut

Indiana—1 school

Culver Military Academy, Culver, Indiana

Massachusetts—5 schools

Browne and Nichols School, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Eaglebrook School, Deerfield, Massachusetts
Groton School, Groton, Massachusetts
Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts
Tabor Academy, Marion, Massachusetts

Maryland—1 school

Friends School of Baltimore, Baltimore, Maryland

New Jersey—3 schools

Pingry School, Elizabeth, New Jersey
Englewood School for Boys, Englewood, New Jersey
Miss Fine's School, Princeton, New Jersey

New York—6 schools

DeVeaux School, Niagara Falls, New York
Harley School, Rochester, New York
Horace Mann, New York, New York
Riverdale Country Day School, New York, New York
Rhodes School, New York, New York
New York Military Academy, Cornwall-on-Hudson, New
York

Pennsylvania—3 schools

Mercersburg Academy, Mercersburg, Pennsylvania
Friends' Central School, Philadelphia 31, Pennsylvania
Hill School, Pottstown, Pennsylvania

Missouri—1 school

Pembroke Country Day School, Kansas City 12, Missouri

Virginia—1 school

Chatham Hall, Chatham, Virginia

Washington, D.C.—1 school

St. Albans School, Washington, D.C.

TABLE IV

TOTAL PRELIMINARY TABULATIONS
SEPTEMBER-DECEMBER 1958

Alaska	1	Nebraska	1
California	25	New Hampshire	1
Colorado	2	New Jersey	6
Connecticut	9	New Mexico	4
Delaware	1	New York	16
Georgia	2	Ohio	7
Illinois	4	Oregon	5
Indiana	2	Pennsylvania	6
Kansas	3	Rhode Island	1
Maryland	1	South Dakota	1
Massachusetts	10	Utah	1
Michigan	11	Virginia	1
Minnesota	3	Washington	9
Missouri	1	Wisconsin	4
Montana	1	Washington, D. C.	<u>1</u>

Total Number Of Schools 140

REVIEWS

Marc Slonim. An Outline of Russian Literature. New York: Oxford University [c. 1958]. 235 pp., \$5.00.

To condense the whole story of Russian literature into less than 250 pages is not an easy task. Professor Slonim, who published earlier a two-volume history of Russian literature from the earliest times to the present day (The Epic of Russian Literature: From the Origins through Tolstoy, 1950, and Modern Russian Literature: From Chekhov to the Present, 1953), has attempted this task in his Outline. The book is divided into eighteen chapters or sections, averaging thirteen pages. The first three sections deal respectively with "The Origins," "Peter the Great and Western Influence," and "Early Nineteenth Century." Then follow sections representing, for the most part, individual vignettes of principal writers (Puškin, Lermontov, Gogol', Turgenev, Gončarov and Ostrovskij, Dostoevskij, Tolstoj, Čexov), with, sandwiched in between, such sections as "From Belinsky to Herzen," "From Nihilists to Revolutionaries," and "Populists and the Writers of the Soil," which introduce literary critics and lesser writers and at the same time help to connect literary developments with the contemporary social-political scene. Modern literature is treated in the four concluding sections: "The Modernist Movement," "The Symbolists," "Gorky and Russian Prose before 1917," and "Literature of the Revolution."

Like Mr. Slonim's earlier volumes, the book is marred by numerous defects, though it is, on the whole, better written. In no way does it replace the abridged version of D. S. Mirsky's History of Russian Literature, published recently in a paperback edition (Vintage K67, \$1.25). What additional material it offers on the modern period does not compensate for the brevity of its main part and for various important defects. The portion dealing with the nineteenth century is the most satisfactory, even though it is not free from both factual errors and questionable statements. Of course, here and there one misses certain things; thus, Puškin's Skazki are not mentioned at all, while his Little Tragedies are no more than mentioned, and their significance will escape the reader not familiar with Russian literature.

It is, however, the initial and concluding chapters that, in their brevity and their high proportion of factual errors and misjudgements, are quite unsatisfactory. In contradistinction to modern literary scholarship, be it in or outside Russia, Mr. Slonim tends to underrate the literary-artistic value of early Russian literature. His treatment of Slovo o polku Igoreve (on

pp. 8-9) is short and inadequate. Among the many factual errors, which bespeak lack of first-hand knowledge of early Russian literature, the following should be mentioned: Ivan Peresvetov, that remarkable sixteenth-century champion of autocracy and author of several political pamphlets in the form of legends, is described as "author of a book of travels" (p. 11); the interesting seventeenth-century biography of Julianija Lazarevskaja by her son is listed, under the title Juliana, as a "popular tale," with such works as Eruslan and Bova (p. 14). At the very beginning of his book, speaking of the earliest translated literature, Mr. Slonim mentions translations from Greek and Bulgarian (p. 5). In the section on the eighteenth century the term "tonic verse" is misleadingly used with reference to the syllabotonic system introduced by Trediakovskij and Lomonosov, while among the models of the earlier Russian syllabic verse the French is mistakenly included. Mr. Slonim also persists, just as in his bigger volume, in using the term "pseudoclassicism," long since discarded by Russian scholars. There is no justification for the statement that Sumarokov "drew on Russian folklore" (p. 19). The dates of birth of Kantemir (p. 19) and of Radiščev (p. 24) are wrong.

There are also several factual errors, though less serious, in the sections dealing with modern literature (Z. Gippius was not born in 1867, p. 174; Vjačeslav Ivanov was nicknamed Vjačeslav the Magnificent, p. 181; Remizov did not derive his "Russian style" from eighteenth-century documents and literature, p. 183; Pilnjak's Krasnoe derevo should be rendered as Mahogany, p. 209; Pasternak's The Year of 1905 is not, at least in idea, a collection of poems, p. 214. In a book of this type and size so many factual errors (and my list is not exhaustive) are inexcusable. The American reader, whose curiosity about Boris Pasternak has been aroused by Doctor Zhivago, will miss all mention of Pasternak's prose writings.

Gleb Struve
University of California (Berkeley)

Dmitrij Čiževskij. Aus zwei Welten: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Slavisch-Westlichen literarischen Beziehungen. (Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, X.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1956. viii, 352.

This work of Dmitrij Čiževskij, who is now Professor of Slavic Philology at the University of Heidelberg, is devoted first of all to the study of motifs. The motifs are of special interest to the author and in the knowledge of them he has very few rivals. At least 15 of the 21 essays contained in his volume (they were written at different times and most of them previously published) are concerned with this field. Čiževskij shows that certain ideas become literary motifs (e.g., "the exiled truth," "the book as a symbol of the cosmos," "God as an artisan," etc.) and that they appear again and again in literary works, sometime varied and changed but always still recognizable and often traceable to their origins—to the ancient

myths, the Old Testament, the Greek and the Roman world, the Gospel, etc. To follow a given motif through the whole of world literature requires, no doubt, an almost encyclopedic knowledge of the material and this is perhaps the reason why this field has been somewhat neglected. But since the appearance of E. R. Curtius' book Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter (Bern, 1948), in which he develops the so-called "Topoilehre," the unity of literature outside from national boundaries has been recognized so clearly and generally that works on literature as such have become more numerous.

Čiževskij has selected some interesting motifs of world literature, the development of which traces in the Slavic literatures, showing their appearance and their variations through the centuries. The author's encyclopedic knowledge of this makes his book fascinating. In his choice of motifs he keeps apart from the trodden way. He chooses neglected topics and follows their evolutions in the different times and peoples.

As his sympathies belong mainly to mysticism, many of the essays are concerned with the development of mystical motifs in the Slavic countries (e. g., "Deutsche Mystik in Russland") or with the influence of some mystic writers (e. g., "Jacob Boehme in Russland," "Svedenborg bei den Slaven"). Great philosophical names appear in essays like "Plato im alten Russland" or "Comenius und die abendländische Philosophie." The author always presents a sound historical and philosophical background, before going into the details of the motifs.

The favorite literary period of Čiževskij is the baroque and here nearly all of his research is absolutely original and extremely important, since this literary movement has been almost completely neglected in the Slavic literatures in spite of its cultural and spiritual values (see "Der barocke Buchtitel"). The originality of the author's research is impressively displayed in "John Owen and Ivan Velyčkovskýj," where he proves that many of the epigrams of this South-Russian writer (whose personality is rather controversial) are translations from the Latin epigrams of John Owen, a fact which was not noticed even by such an eminent scholar as V. N. Peretc.

The essay "Einige Probleme aus der vergleichenden Geschichte der slavischen Literaturen" is of special interest. In it the author tries to define a kind of a new scientific subject: comparative Slavic literature. He does it so carefully and with such a clear discernment of the dangers of generalizations, that sometime one begins to believe in its possibility. Very spirited and persuasive is the essay "Die 'soziale Frage' in den altslavischen Literaturen" in which Čiževskij ironically disposes of the Soviet endeavors to interpret Old Russian Literature in a Marxistic manner. He clearly proves that the only ideology determining all the spiritual disclosures of the time was Christianity and that the literary motif of "poor and rich," which he follows, is treated only from that point of view.

An essay is devoted to Aleksandr Ivanov (1806-58), the only really original painter in Russia. Čiževskij discusses not his art but his mystical philosophy, which is of interest for literature because of its connections with Gogol's utopian ideas concerning the "ideal" Russian State. The important last

period of Ivanov's painting could be interpreted in a better way if his ideas were better known. Unfortunately, M. Alpatov in his new two-volume monograph on Ivanov tries to represent Ivanov as a "realist" and a political revolutionary—which is certainly nonsense. This bars him from seeing the connections between Ivanov and William Blake too (II, 188), which Čiževskij points out apparently without knowing Alpatov's book (which appeared in 1956).

The last three articles of the book are, again, new and interesting. "Esenins 'Lied vom Brot,'" tracing the motif of the "martyrdom of corn" shows the author's knowledge and method at its best. "Majakovskij und Calderon" and "Sten'ka Razin und Polyphem" do not justify in my opinion the stimulating titles they bear. The "convergency" between Majakovskij's famous poem "Razgovor s fininspektorom o poëzii" and Calderon's prosaic opinion on the taxation of painters surely exists, but I just cannot help asking whether we are far enough in our study of literature to pass to accidental "convergencies," when so many concrete connections and influences still have not been examined. The title of the essay suggests a much closer connection between the two poets than there turns out to be. The essay on the "Polyphem-motif" in Russian fairytales is stimulating but its relation to Sten'ka Razin is perhaps too slight for a title.

Čiževskij's book is full of ideas, interesting details, and literary judgments revealing the absolute mastery of its author. It is to be desired that from the great quantity of his scattered articles a second series be printed in the same way.

V. Setschkareff
Harvard University

Dmitrij Tschizewskij. Paradies und Hölle: Russische Buchmalerei. Recklinghausen: Aurel Bongers, 1957. 39 pp. text and 45 pp. reproductions.

Dmitrij Tschizewskij's compact book on paradise and hell in Russian illuminations of the eighteenth century, another volume in the series of publications emerging from the young centre of Byzantine studies at Recklinghausen, is in many ways a pleasant surprise. Not only does he deal with an almost unknown aspect of Russian popular art, but he also confronts us with little-known material from the Slavic Institute of the University of Heidelberg, through which he introduces us to an almost macabre and already slightly Westernized hell of the Russian imagination.

The short text presents three interesting problems to readers who may have neglected Russian manuscripts in favor of icons: (1) After an unsuccessful prelude, bookprinting was introduced in the area around Moscow only in the seventeenth century, and even then was restricted to religious or immediately practical texts. Scriptoria of a commercialized medieval type seem to have existed as late as the early nineteenth

century. (2) Religious reform movements of the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries produced an eschatological consciousness which emerged again violently during the schism of 1666, which left the Russian church divided between the official party, led by the patriarch Nikon, and the Old Believers. Within the latter group illustrations stressing pre-Nikonian beliefs were copied in a consciously archaizing style. (3) It is of great interest to the art historian to analyze the sources for these illuminations. The Apocalypse of St. John which still governed the iconography of the sacred icons seems—at least in the manuscripts of the Old Believers—to have been supplanted by Apocrypha. Tschizewskij mentions the revelations of St. Paul, the so-called Homilies of the monk Palladio on the Second Coming of Christ and the synaxarion attributed to St. Nilus.

The author finds those reasons and sources responsible for the illuminations of heaven and hell in the Heidelberg Codex, which contains several manuscripts and about 3000 illustrations. In the first analysis, the fiery streams in which sufferers gasp, the many devils with conical hairdress seen frontally or in profile, and the rarely missing observer floating within or above the scene make up a realm of strictly popular imagery. If one wants to pierce the Steinbergian economy of line and to overlook the often overstrained verve of Satan and his cohorts of fallen angels, one can discover strange transmutations of Western iconography. The devil as a symbol of self-love sprouting a genealogy of vices, for instance, is derived from representations of the tree of Jesse. In a related example Abraham holding the elect in his lap has become Satan embracing the deadly sins (plates 4, 6). Despite the Western influences which had begun to transform Russian art as early as the sixteenth century the Eastern ideograms were kept. One could mention the throne as a symbol of God, which never really took hold in the West for any length of time and which reappears under superimposed baroque forms (plate 38).

Tschizewskij's book is mainly a book of pictures which aimed to amuse the bourgeois with a world which had then already lost the glare of reality. Under the embroidery-like color scheme of ochre, green, yellow, and black, the human being appears often as a puppet-like ornament bathed in fire, hooked above flames or standing in heavenly light. The author does not need to characterize the personal style of the four artists involved in painting the illustrations which were taken for the Heidelberg volume. However, a hint as to the wide range and development of popular art would have been of interest. One misses an attempt at a comparison between the two-dimensional, often powerful or sinuous forms of the Russian illuminations and the world of the icon or also oriental textiles in which many tendencies influencing the drawings were prefigured. Other possibilities, such as for instance the use of Russian proverbs as a source for new iconographical concepts, may be worth tracing. The different kinds of torture could have been used to interpret the ethical standards of the uncompromising sect. This all could have led to a clearer characterization of the art of the "Old Believers" in contrast to the more courtly and modern art of the official church.

The author presents us with a rare glimpse into the world of the late Biblia Pauperum in Russia. One may fervently hope that the immense treasure of Russian book illumination may be given more prominence in Western scholarly studies. Tschizewskij has proved that it can be a field of the highest interest.

François Bucher
Yale University

Michel Gorlin et Raïssa Bloch-Gorlina. Études littéraires et historiques. (Bibliothèque russe de l'Institut d'Études slaves, XXX.) Paris: Institut d'Études slaves, 1957. 243 pp.

This volume is a tribute of the Institute of Slavic Studies in Paris to the memory of two Russian émigré scholars, Michel Gorlin (b. 1909) and his wife Raïssa Bloch-Gorlina (b. 1899) who, as Jews, were, within two years or so of each other, arrested by the Nazis in France and deported to Germany where they subsequently disappeared without a trace. Michel Gorlin was arrested in May 1941 and deported some fourteen months later. His wife was arrested while attempting to cross into Switzerland, and deported in November 1943. In the meantime, a few months after Gorlin's arrest, their little daughter Dora died.

Michel Gorlin was one of the most promising younger Slavic scholars in Europe between the two wars. He was only ten years old when, after the revolution in Russia, his parents managed to emigrate. After graduating from a high school in Berlin, he studied at Berlin University under Max Vasmer. His doctoral dissertation, published in 1933, dealt with the influence of E. T. A. Hoffmann on Gogol'. In 1932-33 he published, in the Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie, a long study of the reception of Goethe in Russia. Forced to leave Germany because of his non-Aryan origins, he settled down in Paris where he obtained the post of Librarian at the Institut d'Études slaves, relinquished at that time by Professor B. Unbegaun, and became associated with André Mazon, Gregory Lozinskij, and others in the study of the Slovo o polku Igoreve. This led him on to an independent study of early Russian literature, a field which is represented by six pieces out of fifteen in the volume under review. Of the fifteen pieces, nine were published in French (in the Revue des Études slaves and the Revue de littérature comparée), one each in German, English, Polish (in the volume Puszkyn, edited by Waclaw Lednicki, Kraków, 1939), and Russian, and two (written in French) represent unpublished fragments. The diversity of Michel Gorlin's scholarly interests is attested by the titles of some of the most substantial of his studies: "Le Conte populaire dans la littérature russe vers 1830" (1937), "Salomon et Ptolémée: La Légende de Volot Volotovič" (1938), "Les Ballades d'Adam Mickiewicz et Puškin" (1939), a very fine study of Puškin's translations from Mickiewicz; "Le Dit de la Ruine de la terre russe" (published

in 1947): here Gorlin advances the view, still disputed by many scholars, that this famous short fragment, which bears some stylistic resemblance to the Slovo, was not an independent piece but an integral part of a longer work about Prince Jaroslav Vsevolodovič; "Noce Egipskie" (1939); "Alexej Remisov" (1934); "Hoffmann en Russie" (1935); and "The Interrelation of Painting and Literature in Russia" (published in 1946), a very interesting study of the interaction of literature and visual arts in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (the Populists and the Peredvižniki, Blok and Vrubel!), which the present reviewer remembers recommending for publication in the Slavonic and East European Review.

Michel Gorlin combined, in a rare degree, scholarly intuition, breadth of view, and meticulousness with great poetic sensitivity (he was a poet himself; associated with a group of young Russian poets in Berlin called "Novosel'e," he published in 1936 a volume of poems entitled Putešestvie). This happy combination of gifts can be felt in all he wrote.

Raïssa Bloch-Gorlina was an even better poet and has left behind two books of poems—Moj gorod (1928) and Tišina (1935). Some poems were also published by her jointly with Myrrha Lot-Borodina, the wife of the great French medievalist, Ferdinand Lot (Zavety, 1939). As a scholar, her interests lay mainly outside the Slavic field—she was an historian, a medievalist, a pupil of Olga Dobiaš-Roždestvenskaja. Before her forced departure from Germany she was associated with the work on Monumenta Germaniae historica. In France, Ferdinand Lot enlisted her help in the preparation of a new edition of Du Cange's Glossarium. In the volume published by the Institut d'Études slaves we find two of her historical essays, of which only the first has a bearing on Slavic studies: "Verwandtschaftliche Beziehungen des sächsischen Adels zum russischen Fürstenhause im XI. Jahrhundert" and "Une pharmacie sous Charles le Chauve."

The volume is adorned with portraits of Michel and Raïssa Gorlin, drawn by their friend Nina Brodsky. The portrait of Michel Gorlin, probably dating to his early Berlin years, shows an extremely attractive, cheerful face. Professor André Mazon introduces the volume in a short but warmly appreciative preface. In view of the fact that the volume does not contain all of Michel and Raïssa Gorlin's published work, it is perhaps to be regretted that no complete bibliography is attached to it.

Gleb Struve
University of California (Berkeley)

V. I. Malyšev. Povest' o Suxane: Iz istorii russkoj povesti XVII veka. Moskva, Leningrad: Akad. Nauk SSSR, 1956. 224 pp.

Professor Malyšev, like Adrianova-Peretc and Skripil', belongs to the few outstanding Russian scholars who study both Old Russian literature and Russian folklore.

Malyšev's name is linked with the discovery, the publication, and analysis of several Old Russian manuscripts (such as Slovo o pogibeli russkoj zemli, Slovo Daniila Zatočnika, Žitie Aleksandra Nevskogo). One of his discoveries is the Povest' o Suxane, a literary work originating in the seventeenth century and based essentially on a bylina about the same hero. Thus the study about the Povest' concerns both folklore and written literature.

The bylina about Suxan belongs to the cycle dealing with the victory of the Russian bogatyr's over the Tartar hordes. The relationship between the two extant versions of this bylina, the so-called Northern and Altaic, had not hitherto been sufficiently clarified. Scholars had emphasized their constituting a special type, differing from the bylina tradition and possibly of bookish origin; the Altaic version had been considered as strongly corrupted. Malyšev, in the work under review, demonstrates convincingly that both versions belong to the popular bylina tradition. The Altaic version, which is concerned only with the victory over the Tartars, is the older; whereas the Northern version, in which the attention is shifted to the conflict between the hero and the Grand Prince, constitutes a reworking of the Altaic version.

The main aim of Malyšev's work is the clarification of the folklore elements in the Povest', on the one hand, and the literary elements, on the other. His detailed analysis reveals that the folklore elements strongly predominate. Detailed comparison of the Povest' with the byliny about Suxan enables the author to reconstruct the original form of this bylina, which is—as one would expect—quite close to the Altaic version. The literary motifs in the Povest' go back, as Malyšev shows, to the Old Russian "war narratives," preponderantly to the Skazanie o mamaevom pobojšče.

The results of the study of the Povest' are perhaps more significant for Russian folklore than for written literature. They suggest that folklorists should be cautious in judgments as to the corruption of variants, since a seemingly corrupt variant may be the original form. Malyšev's study is characterized by both breadth and depth of scholarship. Though he goes into the minutest details, he comes forth with generalizations which open new horizons.

Felix J. Oinas
Indiana University

Vladimir Seduro. Dostoyevski in Russian Literary Criticism 1846-1956. (Columbia Slavic Studies.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1957. xii, 412, \$7.50.

Probably no Russian writer is a better subject for literary criticism and literary analysis than Dostoevskij. Russian criticism, at least from the 1840's to the 1920's, has been rich, often impassioned, wide-ranging, and very much alive; its contributions to the understanding of literary excellence have been enormous. And it is precisely in their criticism of

Dostoevskij that many Russian critics have put forth their best efforts and reached their greatest heights. The method in Dostoevskij's apparent madness, the depth of his psychological perceptions, the nature of his faith, have presented a challenge that critics of every shade and school have sought to meet.

Mr. Seduro, then, is working a rich field, and despite the fact that any book on criticism is inevitably at two removes from literature itself, his is a stimulating presentation by a scholar who shows himself both thorough and perceptive. Considering the title of the book, he has perhaps leaned rather heavily on the post-Revolutionary period; but since Russian criticism—until stifled in the last two decades—builds almost constantly on what has gone before, he is probably justified. Certainly he has himself demonstrated this progress. His excellent chapter on Baxtin, for example, shows that critic's concept of the "polyphonic" character of Dostoevskij's work as a culmination of some of the best thought in Russian criticism up to that time.

To one for whom Mr. Seduro's sources are not presently available, the book is rather tantalizing. The reader on occasion wishes to pierce through the interpretation to the words of the critic himself, and it is sometimes difficult to know whether the critic or Mr. Seduro is speaking. This confusion arises partly from a mechanical difficulty inherent in such a work. Such phrases as "according to Pereverzev" or "to Gor'kij's mind" could easily be done to death, and the writer is thus almost forced into paragraphs which appear as statements without attribution. This is a problem to which there is no apparent solution, and such slight confusion does not detract materially from the excellence of the book.

From this reviewer, removed by several years and many thousand miles from close familiarity with the subject, one small note on possible factual error. Mr. Seduro states (p. 112) that *The Devils* has not been republished since before 1934. The reviewer remembers seeing a copy of *Besy*, published in the Soviet Union in 1935, with a part of the Introduction cut out and the name of one editor carefully expunged.

John C. Fiske
Dacca, Pakistan

V. Zen'kovskij. *Aus der Geschichte der ästhetischen Ideen in Russland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert.* (Musagetes, VII.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1958. 62 pp.

In his outline of Russian aesthetic thought the author stresses that this is not an exhaustive study, but rather a "sketch," an attempt to discover a pattern of Russian aesthetics. The reason for such an approach is that in this particular field he has practically no predecessor, and had to break the ground before even starting to build on it. Russian literature, philosophy, sociology, and religious thought, continually preoccupied as they were from the early nineteenth century with

the problem of aesthetics, have no clearly expressed and formulated aesthetic system.

Fr. Zen'kovskij shows that Russian aesthetics of some 150 years ago and later was based on the writings of Western authors, especially of the Germans: Novalis, Schlegel and, most important of all, Schelling. In the beginning, the Russian cultural milieu adopted these Western patterns almost blindly, translating a great deal of the existing material or imitating it with little originality. However, everything in that "golden age" of Russian literature developed fast, and Russian original aesthetic thought flowered at the time of Puškin and Gogol'. The latter, according to Zen'kovskij, initiated a trend of aesthetic ideas, which were later in one way or another reflected or developed by the generation that followed him. True, Gogol's ideas stem from German romantics, but they are colored by his own experience, by his own struggle and tragedy. Gogol' had what Zen'kovskij describes as a "utopian" belief in the absolute, dynamic power of beauty. This power did not establish any moral values—it was a criterion in its own right. Thus, for instance, when Gogol' accused the philistine, when he laughed at and scourged triviality (pošlost'), his condemnation was not on ethical and religious grounds: it was an aesthetic judgment. Gogol' dreamed his utopian dream of beauty and art in "Nevskij Prospekt" and "The Portrait," and presented the nightmares of triviality in Revizor and Dead Souls. There came a time of tragic awakening, when Gogol' discovered that he had not been understood. He sought the solution in religion and wanted to express himself according to the religious and moral criterion; but he never lost, as Fr. Zen'kovskij tells us, his utopian faith in beauty and in its magic.

Dostoevskij's aesthetic ideas were expressed far more clearly than Gogol's: they are reflected quite explicitly in his novels, diaries, and letters. Suffice it to recall Prince Myškin's exclamation: "Beauty will save the world." This is no earthly beauty, but universal harmony. For the Idiot, Alëša, and Zosima it was a "vision" as in Puškin's "Poor Knight." For the "Devils" beauty also existed as a matter of consideration and regret, since they had lost it. But for Mitja Karamazov it became a tragic dilemma, a "terrible" and an "awful" thing; Beauty for him was a maze of contradictions, "Sodom" and "the Madonna," where "all boundaries meet." Dostoevskij knew only too well that God speaks in riddles, and after The Brothers Karamazov no answer has really ever been found.

An interesting chapter of Fr. Zen'kovskij's study is devoted to Vladimir Solov'ev. Beauty, and its medium, art, were in Solov'ev's philosophy, part of the absolute, of all-unity in God. Separate manifestations of art remain in the material world, but the fullness of beauty belongs to the kingdom which is not of this world. Art, according to Solov'ev, is a communication with the absolute. Artistic creation has a mystical significance. It is the symbol of a higher reality, which will be revealed at the end of time. In other words, art is not a mere hedonistic function, it has a theurgic and eschatological meaning.

Here we have a dynamic, metaphysical idea of beauty, which Solov'ev developed in his philosophical works as well as

in his poems. He was, as we know, the inspirer of the Russian Symbolist school. To this school, especially to its main representatives (V. Ivanov and A. Blok), Fr. Zen'kovskij devotes the next section of his study. With the Symbolists we again find the prevailing themes of Russian aesthetic thought. Suffice it to quote Blok: "The artist is the man for whom the world is transparent. He does not merely see the foreground of the world, but that which is hidden beyond."

Fr. Zen'kovskij further discusses the aesthetic ideas of two outstanding Russian thinkers of our time: Nicholas Berdyaev and Father Sergius Bulgakov. Each presents a different angle of aesthetic thought, opening new vistas. As the author points out in his concluding lines, the Russian mind has never been satisfied with mere aesthetics. Neither could it live merely on utopian dreams. Throughout all these years, it has been looking for that higher reality, where the good and the beautiful will finally be reconciled.

Helene Iswolsky
Fordham University

Jurij Bojko. Tvorčist' Tarasa Ševčenka na tli zaxidn'o-evro-pejs'koji literatury. Munich: Ukrainian Free University, 1956. 80 pp.

Pavlo Zajcev. Žyttja Tarasa Ševčenka. New York, Paris, München: Naukove Tovarystvo im. Ševčenka, 1955. 400 pp.

Taras Ševčenko is the central figure of Ukrainian literature, and thus works throwing a new light on him are especially welcome.

Pavlo Zajcev proved his competence as a biographer of Ševčenko by editing with Roman Smal-Stocky the works of Ševčenko in fifteen volumes before World War II. He is considered the best connoisseur of Ševčenko's life and creative work at the present time. Ševčenko's relation to Princess Repnin, as well as his plans concerning his marriage to Lykeria Polusmak, are interpreted in a new way. Some intimate affairs of the poet have been left out, as for instance his relation to Mme. Kostomarov, the wife of the famous historian Mikola Kostomarov. The work of Zajcev deserves attention all the more that it gives a valuable commentary not only to the poet's poetry but also to his paintings.

Jurij Bojko, referring to Professor G. Specht, writes that Ševčenko was just such a spiritual exponent of the Ukrainians as Homer was for the Greeks and Virgil for the Romans. The works of Ševčenko are characterized by such melodiousness as attained only by a few poets of world poetry. It has been generally accepted that Ševčenko was inspired by Ukrainian popular poetry (mostly songs) and the Bible. Mr. Bojko traces the works of Ševčenko to the poets of Western European literature. He shows influence on Ševčenko by Shakespeare and Byron, Rousseau and Hugo, Schiller and Goethe, as well as by Dante, and even others. This influence was creative: the thoughts of other poets and writers Ševčenko transformed into his own.

The most interesting discussion, I would say, is that in connection with Byron.

W. Besoushko
Philadelphia

Sebastjan Fabjan Klonowicz. The Boatman: A Voyage down the Vistula from Warsaw to the Green Gate of Danzig. Tr. from the Polish by Marion M. Coleman, Intro. by Mary E. Osborn. Cambridge Springs, Pa.: Alliance College, 1958. 96 pp., \$5.00.

This scholarly rendering into verse is the first English translation of a celebrated Polish poem, Flis, written by Sebastjan Fabjan Klonowicz (1545?-1602) and first published at Rakow in 1595. The author was the son of a well-to-do miller, graduated in law from the old Jagiellonian University at Cracow, and settled in Lublin, where he practiced law and became mayor in 1594. Some of his published work is in Latin, but his Boatman uses his mother tongue.

Mrs. Coleman has taken untiring pains during many years in the preparation of this English edition. She has collation of the text from several Polish editions. Her bibliography of works consulted runs to eighty-five items in six languages, and these are only the most important references in a much larger list. Her notes are as copious as the actual text of the 1884-line poem.

One suspects that Klonowicz originally planned his quatrains as Sapphic stanzas, but that the first three lines slid out of focus into iambic pentameter with feminine endings, leaving only the final Adonic true to type. He rhymes his lines aa, aa, bb, bb. Mrs. Coleman is forced, by the lack of feminine rhymes in English, into chopping all four lines back one syllable into masculine rhymes. A sample stanza (ll. 605-8) runs:

Man's greed for profit is his greatest curse,
Than which no other failing can be worse.
Abundant food for all, our acres yield,
Both wood and field.

If it be objected that the translation is pedestrian throughout, the rejoinder is that the original Polish is likewise pedestrian and that to elevate its style would be to falsify it.

While the poem, true to its Renaissance origin, is saturated with references to Greek and Latin literature, its fundamental importance lies in its value as a social document. Klonowicz is an inland townsman and a devout Calvinist. He is ready to denounce, with the zeal of a modern socialist, "the sickness of an acquisitive society" and never tires of berating the greed of sixteenth century commerce. As he traces a boatman's ride from Cracow down the Vistula to Danzig, he describes not only the perils of navigation but dangers from hostile peasants, the tolls and levies on the way, the pox-ridden doxies of Mostowy Isle, the diet of peas (sometimes mouldy) and porridge, bread and pork, the corrupt officials and the

thieving merchants of the seaport, "where Procurators are but stable-help." The young boatman takes home a spangled belt and a brick-red jacket for his sweetheart Zochna. On their trip back upstream the crew-members spend their time at dice, cards, and wrestling, and even at louse-hunting through each other's hair. The sixteenth century lives again in these pages.

Watson Kirkconnell
Acadia University

Edmund Ordon, ed. 10 Contemporary Polish Stories. Introd. Olga Scherer-Virski. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1958. xxix, 252, \$5.00.

Polish literature, more perhaps than any other, has been finding its way to foreign readers mainly through short-story translations. For various reasons many important Polish novels and dramas (not to speak of poems) are still waiting for translators, but most of the more significant short stories have appeared in foreign languages. Thus it is natural that in Mr. Ordon's choice, which is preceded by several other English selections of stories, one of the principles had to be not to repeat works translated before. The anthology gives samples of Polish short-story writing for the last three decades. It presents authors relatively little known to the English reader, but by no means obscure in Poland; indeed almost all of the ten writers represented in the anthology are very well known in Polish literature. One of them, Marek Hlasko, has recently made an impression of almost sensational character in the West, too: his story, The Eighth Day of the Week, has justly been given very favorable publicity in the American press. I will not enumerate all the authors and titles here. Suffice it to say that all the stories are readable, some unique, most of them respectable as works of literary art.

The editor deserves credit for carrying through this enterprise. It is to be hoped that his intentions of making it a springboard for further collections of Polish literature will materialize. As for the choice of authors and works in this volume, it is a rather individual matter, and consequently one can hardly argue about it. It could be pointed out that writers like J. Parandowski, J. Kaden-Bandrowski, W. Perzyński, or T. Nowakowski can be missed in such a collection more than, e.g., J. Mackiewicz would be. Olga Scherer-Virski took up this question to some extent in her interesting Introduction, stating that the purpose of the collection was not to produce a representative anthology, but rather to give a compact volume of short stories sensu stricto. Even from this point of view certain doubts may in some instances arise. The formulas of "single effect" and "maximum economy of means," judging from the stories included in the volume, may appear somewhat too optimistic. Dąbrowska's technique, for example, though very pleasant and of high stylistic quality, is rather novelistic and can hardly be termed economy of means. Zawiejski's story, on the other hand, is hardly the best example of singleness of effect.

My real quarrel with the editor concerns the lack of consistency in spelling Polish names. In some stories the names are Anglicized; in others they are not; in still others they appear in capricious and even distorted form. In Wierzyński's story, for example, the Polish sz may be retained in some cases (Ptaszkow) or transliterated as sh (Dolshak). (The same name, furthermore, appears in the original in the form Dolszek and not Dolszak.) This is only one example of many dubious renderings which in the totality create a somewhat irritating effect, as the various translators struggle, every man for himself, with forms that defy simple Anglicizing. (The form Rysio becomes Richie, but Werosia only changes the W into V; Szczepan remains Szczepan, but Tomasz changes to Thomas; Madzia remains Madzia, but Szymon becomes Simeon, etc., etc.)

I am fully aware of all the difficulties involved, but some degree of uniformity could probably be attained. I mention this point here not so much to criticize the present volume; I rather hope that a little grumbling on my part may contribute to establishing a generally more satisfactory practice in the future. I feel sure that the book will be enjoyed by all those interested in literature.

Z. Folejewski
University of Wisconsin

Slavistična Revija: Časopis za literarno zgodovino in jezik,
X letnik, Rajku Nahtigalu za osemdesetletnico. Ljubljana,
1957. 334 pp.

The contribution of Slovenia to Slavistics stands in no proportion to the size of the country. The second smallest Slavic nation, it has still produced scholars of such distinction as B. Kopitar and F. Miklosich, the founders of Slavistics in the modern sense of that term. In the twentieth century the names of M. Murko, F. Ramovš, and R. Nahtigal have commanded the respect and admiration of students in the field. This veneration is reflected in this Festschrift, honoring Nahtigal on his eightieth birthday, and which has appeared as the tenth yearbook of the Slavistična Revija. Among the participants in the book we find, along with the Slovenes, scholars from France, Bohemia, Sweden, Serbia, Germany, the United States (Jakobson, Lunt), Bulgaria, Italy, Russia, England, Austria, Finland, and Croatia. The variety of languages used is like an international flag display in honor of this great scholar. Unfortunately, the Festschrift for Nahtigal turned out to be a memorial. On March 30, 1958, soon after the publication of the book, Nahtigal died in his home in Ljubljana, fifteen days prior to his eighty-first birthday (born April 14, 1877).

To a great extent, the make-up of the volume enables the reader to have an insight into at least the main problems which occupied Nahtigal as a scholar. He made his most important contributions in the field of Old Church Slavonic (OCS) studies. Questions concerning the biographies of Constantine

and Methodius, the creation of the Slavic alphabets, and the studies of OCS texts were in the center of Nahtigal's interest and a point of departure for his work on etymologies, grammatical problems, and accentology. In etymology he was particularly original in clarifying some obscure words in OCS (as well as in Old Slovene—the Fragments of Freising); he developed a special type of etymological method based on comparative approach in combination with a thorough philological analysis. In grammar he began with the morphological problems of OCS (Instr. sg. fem. in -q and -ojo, imperative in -ěte ~ -ate). In accentology his starting point was Russian: in 1928 he published a book on Russian accent in the declension of substantives. But from there he proceeded to the reconstruction of OCS, Old Slovene, and Old Russian accent: he boldly attempted to reconstruct the accentual systems of such texts as the most ancient OCS poems, the Fragments of Freising, and the Igor' Tale. From all these studies grew his synthetic work Slovenski jeziki (1938, 2nd ed. 1952), one of the best outlines of Slavic comparative phonology and morphology. He also worked on problems in Russian grammar, and Albanian. In the last years of his life, he was involved in collecting and publishing the works of B. Kopitar. It must be added that Slavistics is greatly indebted to Nahtigal for his model publication of the complete text of Euchologium Sinaiticum (1941-42, in two volumes; the planned third volume unfortunately never appeared).

For the most part, Nahtigal's Festschrift presents articles concerned with those problems in which Nahtigal himself worked. As a rule the articles are minor contributions whose importance lies not so much in themselves as in the fact that they supplement and confirm the conclusions of the Master. They should, consequently, be evaluated from this point of view. It is impossible here to indulge in an analysis of the viewpoints presented in each article. It suffices to enumerate them, to give an idea of the contents of the book.

As is to be expected, the most numerous contributions are made in problems of OCS. Thus, F. Grivec analyzes the OCS attempts at translating Gr. katholikós with the words vselenskij and sobornyj. E. Georgiev contributes to the problem of Methodius' translations, advancing a rather disputable hypothesis that the translations of eight works, ascribed to his brother Constantine, were actually his. J. Vašica seeks new proof, in the manner of translating Greek porneúō, that Zakon sudnyi ljudem was a work of St. Constantine. H. Lunt meticulously studies ligatures in OCS manuscripts, while A. Vaillant presents a list of quotations from the Bible in the Codices Suprasliensis and Clozianus. R. Aitzetmüller classifies the manuscripts of Sestodnev by John, the Exarch of Bulgaria. R. Jakobson sums up research on insertions in verse in different Old Moravian texts on St. Cyril. The contribution of D. Čiževsky on kenningar in Old Russian literature is indirectly connected with that of K. Horálek on verse intonation through the problems of the Slavic verse and rhythmic organization of text. A. Cronia presents a contribution to the history of the Glagolitic alphabet in the seventeenth century. J. Trypučko, taking his point of departure in OCS texts, traces how the suffix -ošti ~ ošči (type radošči) developed in various Slavic languages.

Etymology is represented in the book by the articles of F. Bezlaj (Slovene dialectal and old sovatna, smet), B. Unbegaun (Russian names for compass) and G. Čremošnik (place-names of the type Trebnje). Problems of Slavic accentology are touched upon by V. Kiparskij (stress shifts in Russian monosyllabic substantives) and L. Sadnik (accent in Common Slavic dymě, in -n- stems). The two problems on which Nahtigal worked in his old age, those of Kopitar and the Igor' Tale, are studied in the articles of J. Matl and M. Ibrovac (Kopitar and C. B. Hase), on the one hand, and the history of the translations of the Igor' Tale into Croatian and Serbian by J. Badalić, on the other. An analysis of Old Russian phonemes, as reflected in the records of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, is given by W. K. Matthews. The least well represented problems in the Festschrift are those of Slavic comparative phonology and morphology: one finds only a single article by V. Machek on Slavic verbs with the suffix -sk. It is however one of the most interesting contributions in the book.

There are also some articles in the volume which have no, or only a remote, connection with the problems on which Nahtigal worked. Among them, a characterization of the use of personal names by the upper class of Dubrovnik in the Middle Ages, written by I. Mahnken, is especially rich in new material and observations. R. Kolarič analyzes V. Vodnik's translation of 1814 as a contribution to the history of modern literary Slovene. R. Jenč collects facts concerning the (not too active) cultural relations between the Sorbs and the peoples of Yugoslavia. J. Vuković devotes one more article to the perennial problem of the functions of the aorist in modern Serbo-Croatian. M. Braun tries to find out what the notorious Sprachgefühl is. V. Borkovskij accumulates excerpts from Old Russian charters on the use of conjunctions, this time presenting the conjunction aže. M. Pavlović finds a suffix of Romance origin in the Macedonian dialect of Debar. C. Thörnqvist publishes a minor contribution to our knowledge of A. Jensen, and N. Preobraženskij to Prešerniana. One article is devoted to ethnography: that of I. Grafenauer on the practice of human sacrifice before starting some large construction.

Finally, the Festschrift contains some materials on Nahtigal himself. F. Tomšič gives a brief summary of Nahtigal's activities, A. Slodnjak elucidates what Nahtigal did for the history of Slovene literature, R. Jagoditsch evaluates his research on the Igor' Tale, and F. Jakopin presents a bibliography of his publications after 1948 (Nahtigal's publications for the preceding period are listed in the Slavistična Revija, Vol. I, 1948).

The articles in the Festschrift on the whole present no revelations. But they are useful, primarily as supplements to the research of Nahtigal himself.

George Y. Shevelov
Columbia University

Ad. Stender-Petersen. Russian Studies. (Acta Jutlandica, Aarsskrift for Aarhus Universitet, XXVIII/2, Humanistisk Serie 43.) København, 1956.

These studies by Stender-Petersen were originally intended as a part of a collective work planned by Professor Simmons of Columbia University, to be entitled "The Peoples and Languages of the Soviet Union." The specific character of the book is explainable against the background of the original project. For its purpose is, as we learn in the Preface to the Danish edition, to give not a survey of Russian history and literature, but a picture of the "unofficial cultural history" of the Russian people. By Russian people, Stender-Petersen means only one class: the Russian peasantry. The idea that the Russian peasantry has through the centuries been the sole bearer of the "unofficial culture" of Russia permeates the entire book and is supposed to lend unity to the eight chapters, which cover the following subjects: The Russian Population, The Rise of the Russian Peoples and their Languages, The Origin of the Russian Ethnic Names, Russian Paganism, Russian Christianity, Russian Folklore, The History of the Russian People, Mental Structure.

The first chapter contains a statistical and geographical survey of the Eastern Slavs. In the second chapter we find an interesting brief survey of the main theories concerning the formation of the Eastern Slavic peoples and dialects. The lack of reference to the "official" aspect of linguistic history, i. e., to the formation of the three Eastern Slavic literary languages, makes it difficult to grasp the present-day differences between Great Russian, Belorussian, and Ukrainian, inasmuch as purely historical and dialectal criteria do not permit us to draw any clear-cut boundaries between them. Some linguistic statements contained in this chapter are, unfortunately, misleading. Thus the author states that "East Slavic, like Polish, has palatalized all consonants before front vowels"; synchronically this is inexact both for Polish (which lacks soft dentals) and for Ukrainian (which has only soft dentals); whereas diachronically, palatalization of consonants was a general East-Western (and partially Southern Slavic) phenomenon. In Ukrainian, the vowels *i*, *y* supposedly underwent levelling, while the consonants were hardened before *i*, *e*; however, Ukrainian is the only Slavic language which has, in fact, preserved the distinction *i*/*y*; it furthermore admits soft consonants before *i* < *e*. Typically Belorussian sounds are allegedly *č*, *ž*; but it is more correct to speak of the consonants *č'*, *ž'* for Belorussian, whereas *č*, *ž* are found elsewhere in the East (Western Ukraine). The change *e* > *o* had such a complex and diverse development both within East and West Slavic that it cannot be treated on a par with the other East-West phonetic features.

In the following chapter, the author expounds his theories on the history of the Russian ethnic names and the early history of Russia, which are now generally accepted by the scholarly world (with the exception of Soviet scholars). The extension of the "Varangian theory" to explain the origin of paganism (in Chapter IV) seems, however, unwarranted. While the author rejects as too complex and fantastic the theories which

view Slavic primitive religion as a part of an Indo-European heritage, he presents in their stead more highly strained explanations with scanty substantiation. His central thesis is that Russian theology, which superseded an older stage of demonology, was the import and property of the ruling Norseman, with some literary and foreign embellishments. The direction of religious development is for him always a transition from demonology to theology, although the opposite change is equally plausible and has, in fact, been assumed both for Iranian and Slavic. The striking similarities between Baltic and Slavic, as well as between Northern Slavic and Russian mythology, he considers merely the result of foreign influences. Volos was, in his opinion, the agriculturalists' borrowing from Greek St. Blasius, and the variant Veles a product of poetic speculation. It is hard to see why an original *Vlas would yield a polnoglasje from, even before the time of Old Church Slavonic influence, and why the Slavic peasants would adapt a Greek name, while the Norse warriors took over Slavic forms (Perun for Thor). The true religion of the Russian people has, according to the author, been through the ages only an animism which was "adequate to the requirements of the life of the Russian peasantry." Christianity, as well as pagan theology, remained basically alien to the Russians, because "the mass of population had not the time to assimilate ... its external form nor inner meaning." The meaningfulness of such assertions would, perhaps, gain in clarity if we tried to apply them to other peoples as well.

The chapter on Folklore is devoted primarily to a discussion of the Russian byliny. The author accepts the theory of the epic as gesunkenes Kulturgut, and believes that it stems from a lyrical or semi-lyrical genre. While his critical remarks concerning the historical approach to the epic are interesting and most valuable, the above theories require qualifications. There are certain motifs and layers in the epic which precede the period of the Kievan principality, and genetically as well as formally the epic has little in common with the lyrical tradition. The formal aspect of the epic is, however, ignored in the exposition.

In the last chapter, Stender-Petersen criticizes the naive anthropological-sociological methods which attempt to explain the "Russian soul." It must be said, however, that his proposed socio-psychological method, based primarily on intuition and personal observations, brings us not much further. While one can agree that the peasant class can be sociologically defined, the discussed contradictory traits of the Russian peasantry, such as vigor and inertia, enthusiasm and fatalism, can be ascribed to other peasantries, and cultures, too. Since the Revolution, the author argues, this mentality has been undergoing a deep change: the chief factor responsible for this change is collectivization; the homogeneous, drab mass of peasants is presently being transformed into a class of individualists, with a sense of responsibility and interest in production. To the reader familiar with the history of the kolkhoz, with the official policy of liquidation not only of the kulak but of all class differences in the village, and with the uniformity

which pervades most of Soviet life, these conclusions sound rather curious.

While the book of Stender-Petersen contains some neat summaries of problems and many interesting ideas, it could hardly be recommended as a textbook for the uninitiated. Others, like this reviewer, will probably find it too uneven and too controversial.

Edward Stankiewicz
Indiana University

Albert B. Lord, Beginning Serbocroatian. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1958. 132 pp.

This slim volume is the printed form of a textbook, written by Professor Lord in 1950 and used, during the following years, in mimeographed versions by students at Harvard. The book is divided into a Preface (pp. 7-8), an Introduction (pp. 9-14), twenty-two lessons (pp. 15-95), additional exercises (pp. 96-97), a Croatian text (pp. 98-105), and two glossaries (pp. 127-132). The evolutionary process has not yet produced a Table of Contents or an Index.

A large amount of the limited amount of space in this book is quite necessarily devoted to explanations of grammar. There are, in addition, various exercises, some conversational material (in the first ten lessons), and two major texts. The first text, "The Boers and the English" by the Serbian writer Sremac (1855-1906), appears in Cyrillic and is utilized as a reading exercise in the Introduction and as translation exercises in subsequent lessons. One would have expected, for pedagogical reasons, that the Croatian text, "Stribor's Forest" by Brlić-Mažuranić (1874-1938), would come first, but page sequence is perhaps not so important in a small book.

Lord's approach to his task of describing this Slavic language is traditional or, more exactly, early traditional. His aseptic presentation of noun endings (p. 16), after which the reader views the pre-ending nominal stuff, took me back in memory to Goodwin's A Greek Grammar. But even tradition will not countenance the inclusion of "Verbs in -ěti" in the author's classification of verbs. What relevance to modern Serbo-Croatian (or Serbocroatian) can a statement such as the following (p. 73) have: "Verbs in -ěti have their present in -ěm (ǎměti, ǎměm) or -im (vǐděti, vǐđim)"?

Lord's attention is mainly on the Serbian dialect and this, while facilitating the description, oversimplifies it. The student should be informed, for example, that the Croatian word for "who" is tko (it appears in the text [p. 100], but is not glossed or included with the interrogative pronouns [p. 55]), that an expression such as A šta ćeš da studiraš (p. 38) is distinctively Serbian, that the future form gledaću (p. 33) appears in Croatian texts as gledat ću, and so on. However, "the book presupposes a teacher" (p. 7), and we must assume that the teacher is informed on these and other points.

Accentuation in the glossaries seems, in general, to be

accurate, though a casual survey turned up errors, e.g., seljaka (p. 120) for correct seljaka; kòlač, kolàča (p. 111) for correct kòlâč, kolâča. I noticed several cases where the accent has yet to be added, e.g., iskâčëm (p. 100) for correct iskâčëm; Mletâkâ (p. 113) for correct Mlètâkâ. Lord's maintenance of the older system of indicating vowel length in unstressed syllables seems needlessly antique. He writes, for example, pòznâjëm, where Belić and other Yugoslav linguists would write pòznâjëm. In current usage the accent mark ^ is used for the stressed long fall, e.g. pîvî [= Lord's pîvî], and also to distinguish, in otherwise unaccented texts, the genitive plural of nouns from similar appearing forms, e.g., nom. sg. novela : gen. pl. novelâ; the latter form, so marked, is actually used on page 73, but without explanation. Aspect is haphazardly indicated; on page 109, for example, seven verbs are characterized as to aspect, while seven are ignored.

This work may be quite useful to Slavists and to students of slavistics, though hardly, it seems to me, to students attempting to learn the Serbo-Croatian (/Serbocroatian) language. That it has been successful at Harvard testifies, I would think, to the high quality of Professor Lord's teaching. If, in a future edition, the texts and conversational bits could be subtracted, we would then have a valuable manual, much like Čorović's Serbokroatische Grammatik in the Göschen series.

Thomas F. Wagner
University of Minnesota

George S. Counts. The Challenge of Soviet Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. [c. 1957]. xii, 331, \$6.00.

In his comprehensive book Professor Counts deals not only with the different Soviet school systems but with education in the broadest sense of the word. As a humanitarian and a true liberal he follows with anxiety the methods used by a totalitarian regime to mold the mind of the people according to a preconceived pattern and is deeply concerned over the threat such a system presents to the free world.

The history of Soviet education is traced to its very beginning and full consideration is given to the rich legacy inherited from the tsarist times. The main source which inspired the Bolsheviks with their political as well as educational ideas the author sees in the revolutionary period of the seventies of the nineteenth century, especially in the theories of Peter Tkačev. Tkačev, a terrorist impressed by the ideas of the French revolutionary Auguste Blanqui, believed that the government could be overthrown by a small determined group, and that socialism then could be imposed and the people re-educated by dictatorial methods. The author constantly returns to these theories of Tkačev, overemphasizing their importance in the sphere of Soviet education, for it is doubtful whether Tkačev's ideas meant much, if anything, in educational practice. Soviet education has been determined not only by political factors but also by socio-economic developments and by inherited traditions.

At present, for instance, the expansion of industry and the need of adequately educated manpower are the cause of fundamental changes in the school system. Soviet education is now absorbing many traditions of the pre-Revolutionary Russian school and many of the ideas of the great Russian pedagogues of the nineteenth century. Though this is objectively stated in the book, the reader is hardly aware of it, since his attention is focused far more on political facts and ideological problems.

The best chapters of the book are those that deal with the evolution of the people's school. A detailed account is given of the period of experimentation in the twenties, in which knowledge was subordinated to political education, and of the school reform of the thirties that introduced the stress on subject matter. In the chapter on moral education a profound analysis is given of the Soviet version of civic education, a blend of Russian nationalism and Soviet patriotism. If the author had limited his discussion to the history and practice of education alone, it would be a valuable source on this subject. However, the author is carried away by the ideological aspect of Soviet education and includes a wide range of subjects, such as the penological system, forced labor camps, industrialization, collectivization—in short, an account of the social and political reality of Soviet Russia. From his own point of view the author is consistent. The aim of the book is to discuss all the means by which the public mind is educated. The lay reader, however, may be overwhelmed by such a wealth of information and lose sight of the main topic, i. e., Soviet education as such and its challenge.

The author concludes his book with an assessment in which he gives objectively all existing views on the subject of how Soviet education may affect the future of Communism and humanity. The author himself is inclined to see the challenge of Soviet education in its ideological foundations and thinks it has to be met with an appropriate philosophy of education in free societies. He even suggests that such a volume on American education may be forthcoming.

Abraham Kreusler
Randolph-Macon Woman's College

Marija Gimbutas. The Prehistory of Eastern Europe, I.
(American School of Prehistoric Research, Peabody Museum, Harvard University, Bulletin No. 20.) Cambridge, Mass.: Peabody Museum, 1956. ix, 241, plates, \$7.50.

This monumental volume supplies the first comprehensive survey of the stone-age cultures of the eastern half of the European continent. Although the great importance of this area, especially in relation to the origin, differentiation, and spread of Indo-European speaking peoples in Europe, has long been recognized by prehistorians and philologists alike, it has continued to be regarded as an inaccessible terrain. The main reason for this has been, of course, the language barrier. Dr. Gimbutas' mastery of several of these languages has now given

us the first monograph on the Eastern European stone age based on the first-hand scrutiny of all available sources.

What makes this volume an invaluable contribution to the broad field of European prehistory in general, is the consistency with which the author underlines the interlocking and intertwining of prehistoric cultures between Eastern and Central or Northern Europe. In the first chapter the genetic unity of the Forest culture (Maglemose-Kunda complex) around the southern Baltic is recognized, as well as its spread to the east and its survival in the Central Russian forest zone. In the third and fourth chapters Eastern European prehistory is connected with Central European prehistory with the help of Tripolye and Danubian cultures. In the same chapter the Funnel Beaker culture (the First Northern) receives a well-deserved treatment. Only very recently, thanks to works of Vogt and Piggott, have we been becoming aware of its strong impact on the so-called western cultural groups of pre-historic Europe.

In the second chapter Dr. Gimbutas analyzes the Kurgan culture of the Eastern European steppes; in the fifth chapter she follows the appearance of Kurgan elements in the Globular Amphora culture and their spread northwestward at the expense of Funnel Beaker culture to the Saale-Elbe region. In her opinion the Globular Amphora culture represents a fusion of the intrusive Pontic elements with those of the Funnel Beaker culture; the similarity between the Globular Amphora culture and that of the Kurgan hut-graves period is most conspicuous in graves and pottery. The Corded Ware and Battle Axe complex of the following period is interpreted by Dr. Gimbutas as a survival and successor culture of the Globular Amphora complex, and the differentiation of this corded ware complex into various divergent subgroups (Saxo-Thuringian, Southeastern Baltic, Złota, etc.) probably reflects the splitting of the more or less uniform culture of the preceding phase into separate branches under the influence of local substrata.

Dr. Gimbutas pays due attention also to the problem of the origin and diffusion of Indo-European-speaking peoples. She is to be complimented for having discarded the now outdated theory of identifying the Saxo-Thuringian Corded Ware people with original Indo-Europeans; however, her theory, substituting the Kurgan hut-grave people to take the role of Saxo-Thuringians, fails to be flawless. We would be on a much safer ground if we would postulate that the hut-grave people of the Kurgan culture were already speaking a later Indo-European idiom, perhaps the Ur-Satem dialect, or even more probably the common Indo-Iranian.

The Near Eastern linguistic evidence proves that the Globular Amphora and Corded Ware-Battle Axe migrations could not have brought the first Indo-Europeans of the Kentum branch into Central Europe. They must have been there already. As a working hypothesis, the Funnel Beaker people could be considered as the representatives of the first Indo-Europeans in Central Europe. The recognition of Funnel Beaker elements in the eastern province of the Windmill Hill culture by Piggott, and the interpretation of the Michelberg culture as a southwestern province of the Funnel Beakers of Vogt lends much weight to it. Also the rapid differentiation of the Battle Axe-Corded

Ware complex into separate subgroups under the influence of local substrata seems to corroborate it.

Dr. Gimbutas' rejection of a uniform comb- and Pit-marked Pottery complex in Northeastern Europe is based on good evidence, but her negative approach to the linguistic side of the problem, namely the origin and diffusion of the Finno-Ugrian stock, is far from solving the question. This very complex problem is in dire need of a thorough re-examination from the archaeological, as well as linguistic and anthropological, point of view.

Dr. Gimbutas' monograph represents the first attempt to treat the large field of eastern European archaeology as a whole. Its outstanding and lasting qualities appear in the following: (1) the presentation of the results of the field work in eastern Europe in mid-twentieth century and its correlation with the prehistory of central Europe; (2) a sound, careful, critical, and independent approach to the chronological problems and the evidence of stratification; and (3) the suggestion of new approaches and new solutions to the crucial problems of central European late neolithic. It is an extremely important contribution to European prehistory, and we can only hope that its second part will follow soon.

Viktor Kõressaar
New York Public Library

George Kennan. Siberia and the Exile System. Abridged from the first edition of 1891. With an Introd. by George Frost Kennan. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1958. xix, 244, \$5.00.

George Kennan began the difficult journey described in this book in the belief that the Russian government's measures taken in the struggle with the revolutionaries had been unfairly condemned and that the latter were "unreasonable and wrong-headed fanatics." However, his first meeting with a political exile, in Semipalatinsk, persuaded him differently and initiated a complete change of view. As a result, the book was a burning indictment of the exile system and the tsarist regime.

According to the dust jacket, the reasons for reissuing the work in the present abridged form at this time include restoring to the public a report "essential to an understanding of the present-day Russian regime" and also suggesting to the reader the "disconcerting" comparison between Tsarist Russia's use of the concepts of "guilt by association, guilt by refusal to inform on others, guilt by reason of past activities, punishment as a precautionary measure for something not yet done" and their use by the United States government today. In fact, neither the excellent Introduction to the second edition written by the author's gifted nephew, George Frost Kennan, nor any other insertion in the whole book attempts to connect the conditions described therein either with the Soviet regime or the contemporary American scene. The Introduction describes the author's life and work well and briefly, but his nephew does not

conceal his own reservations about the author's failure to consider fully the "reckless and certainly criminal actions" involved in the "preposterous and indiscriminate campaign of terrorism" which resulted in the exile of many of the prisoners described in the book.

The author reports with evident faithfulness everything he sees, and distinguishes between the humane officials who tried to improve prison conditions and those who were corrupt, callous, and vicious. However, he neglects to make other distinctions—between trial by jury in Russia (which he does not mention; he devotes almost a page to Vera Zasulič without noting that a jury actually acquitted her for a terrorist act which she did not attempt to deny) and other types of trial or "exile by administrative process" (to which he gives a whole chapter), or between the political exiles' level of education and private morality and some of the acts which they committed. Kennan's book was a piece of journalism intended to expose certain evils; this it did with success. However, it is an act of dubious responsibility on the part of the publisher to represent the newly reissued portion of the work (or indeed the complete original) as being a sufficiently balanced picture of Russian law, Russia, or Siberia of the time to enable the reader to draw conclusions which bear on the evaluation of the Soviet regime or contemporary American justice.

Donald W. Treadgold
University of Washington

Georg von Rauch, A History of Soviet Russia. New York: F. A. Praeger, 1957. xiii, 493, \$6.75.

Although the Soviet regime is now forty-odd years old, its historiography is surprisingly scanty, and the general histories of the Soviet Union can be counted on the fingers of one hand. The reason why historians have tended to avoid broad historical surveys of that country are partly to be sought in the delicate political aspects of this topic, and partly in purely technical difficulties, namely the inadequacy of primary and monographic sources. For the period of the Revolution and Civil War, the primary materials are extremely rich, since nearly every literate participant either wrote down his memoirs or was interviewed by historians, and the Soviet government, operating through its institutions of Party history, has published tons of additional materials. The opposition movements are not quite as well served as the Bolshevik movement, and many facets of the White movement are still obscure, but the documentation of their history is still quite adequate. In the NEP period the source materials begin to dry up, but fortunately there exists a large body of information gathered by the opposition (much of it published by émigré journals like the Socialističeskij vestnik) and by Trockij, whose archive is presently at Harvard. After Stalin's seizure of power, i.e., after roughly 1930, reliable primary materials on internal policy became virtually nonexistent. It is no exaggeration to say that we have less

authentic documentary information on the internal events in Soviet Russia during the decade preceding and following World War II than we have about Imperial Rome or the Russia of the first Romanovs. The sources on the collectivization of the Russian peasantry, for instance, are approximately as adequate (or inadequate) as those on the peasantry's first enservment at the end of the sixteenth century. The primary sources for this period fall primarily into the realm of foreign policy, where, owing to the capture of German documents and the release of certain state papers, we have a fairly adequate documentation of such important events as the Nazi-Soviet pact and the quarrel between Tito and Stalin.

The monographic literature on Soviet history has not unexpectedly adapted itself to the primary sources. It is relatively abundant for the early period, 1917-1924; it is thinner for the NEP; and for the quarter of a century of Stalinist dictatorship consists mostly of studies of foreign policy and the international Communist movement.

Considering the general inadequacy of the foundations on which he had to constrict his survey, Mr. von Rauch has acquitted himself well. His book is based on a thorough study of the secondary literature, and is written objectively and competently. The manner of treatment is chronological and descriptive rather than analytical, that is, it concentrates on describing the principal events, leaving interpretation pretty much alone. The emphasis, as may be expected, is on foreign policy, which takes up nearly the whole of the second half of the book. This part is more satisfactory than the first, that devoted to the antecedents and triumph of Bolshevism. I think that this difference in quality is due not to the documentation, which, if anything, is superior for the first half, but to the fact that the author does not seem to have made up his mind as to the nature of Bolshevism. Diplomatic and military activities, designed as they are under every political system to defend the material interests of the state, do not demand of the historian a more or less firm theoretical conception. Internal policies are a different matter. Being the result of the interplay of many diverse interests, they cannot be satisfactorily explained without a good grasp of the principal social and intellectual forces as well as of the traditional framework within which these forces operate. Whenever he is compelled to explain why certain things happened, Mr. von Rauch either refers to others, equally inexplicable factors, or falls back on mystic explanations evolved by neo-Slavophile émigrés like Berdyaev. He firmly rejects, however, the theory that Bolshevism was an inescapable consequence of the development of Russian history.

In conclusion, one must commend the author for the forthrightness with which he discusses the crimes and follies of the Hitlerite government in its dealings with Soviet Russia. His book conveys the sense of sympathy for Russia and the Russians which characterized the school of Otto Hoetzsch and the old Osteuropa, without sharing their political naiveté. In this respect it is symptomatic of the political maturing which has taken place in Germany since the recent debacle.

Richard Pipes
Harvard University

Myron Rush. The Rise of Khrushchev. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press [c. 1958]. vii, 116, \$3.25.

Herbert Marcuse. Soviet Marxism: A Critical Analysis. (Studies of the Russian Institute.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1958. v, 271, \$4.50.

Oliver H. Radkey. The Agrarian Foes of Bolshevism: Promise and Default of the Russian Socialist Revolutionaries February to October 1917. (Studies of the Russian Institute.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1958. xv, 521, \$8.50.

What these three books have in common is, on the one hand, the subject matter of Communism and its environment, and on the other, the methodological problem of how to approach the phenomenon of ideology in Soviet studies. The three books represent three different methods of dealing with ideological content. Apart from their significance as contributions to knowledge, they are thus also interesting examples of what to do and what not to do with ideology as an object of research.

Mr. Rush's little book is a superb example of what expertise in Soviet ideology should be and can do. Mr. Rush assumes that the Soviet system is shot through with ideological content, and that ideological developments are therefore most revealing about the hidden political processes there. Soviet ideology consists of a set of symbols through which Communists express to each other and to their subjects the meaning of their rule and their intentions. To someone steeped in Soviet symbolism its knowledge can be used as a key to discover what is going on behind the otherwise locked doors of Soviet leaders and high Party councils. Mr. Rush has learned to subject the Soviet press and publications to a fine-tooth comb analysis of formulas, concepts, and slogans. This, of course, presupposes thorough knowledge of the role various symbols have played in the history of Communism, as well as a capacity to reproduce in one's own mind the Communists' feelings about these symbols. Rush possesses both. He has put himself in a position where he is able to take advantage of the Communist propensity to "put it all on paper," to give each of their turns its ideological identification.

He finds that Khrushchev relatively early set out to assume the mantle of Stalin but ran into the opposition of fearful members of the Politbureau. He manipulated the symbols of Stalin's authority to attach the nimbus of Stalin's name to himself. It was only logical that his opponents, in trying to block him, concentrated their attack precisely on the glory of Stalin's memory. De-Stalinization thus was well underway by the middle of January 1956, a full month before the Twentieth Congress. The pawns in this game were concepts to which Westerners might attribute little importance but which are loaded with meaning for Communists: the designation of the secretarial office ("general secretary" or "first secretary" or "First secretary"), the description of the Presidium in its relation to the Central Committee, the formula used to define the "alliance of workers and peasants," etc. Each of these symbols evoked memories of the past and hinted at intentions as well as trends. Because Soviet

power-struggles have always had dogmatic consequences, dogmatic formulations are necessarily instruments of power. Mr. Rush comes to the conclusion that Xruščev is basically a Stalinist: "Khrushchev evidently adopted the strategy for gaining dictatorial power which Stalin had employed after Lenin's death. He must have assumed that the mechanics of political power in the Soviet Union had not changed essentially from what they had been in the 1920's. Events seem to prove him right."

Mr. Rush's book offers some hope that out of our institutes of Soviet studies we can obtain at least a few experts who can read the enemy's mind like our own. This ability, however, can be acquired only by entering the Communist ideological world with a sense of reality as well as spiritual independence. In other words, one must resist the twin temptations of either rejecting Communist ideology as mere window-dressing or else assuming that one can understand it only on the basis of sympathy and shared premises. The latter is the case with Marcuse's study of Soviet Marxism.

Marcuse sets himself the task of subjecting Soviet ideology to an immanent critique which "starts from the theoretical premises of Soviet Marxism, develops their ideological and sociological consequences, and re-examines the premises in the light of these consequences." The book does not carry out this intention. It consists of a number of papers on Communist ideological concepts in which Marcuse most brilliantly plays back and forth between Marx, Soviet ideology, and what he calls Western ideology. One would expect him to start from Marx as the premise, move from there to the "ideological and sociological consequences" in Soviet society, and back to a re-examination of Marx. Instead, the Marxian premise remains unmoved and unexamined and is used as a norm by which Marcuse judges the West (with hopeless scorn) and the Soviets (with ultimately hopeful regret).

What is the content of the book? It is difficult to say. Marcuse continuously shifts his ground and method. Now he philosophizes on the deeper meaning of Marx, now he confronts Marx with the theory and practice of the West (which, he seems to feel, does not have a leg to stand on), here he sums up Soviet ideological developments, and there he analyzes the structure of Soviet society. The reader, however, is never advised whether at any given time it is Marx, or Stalin, or Marcuse, that is speaking, or whether a given part of Soviet ideology is or is not warranted in the light of the premises.

If one turns from chapter to chapter looking for the author's conclusion, one finds them, significantly enough, not in the field of Soviet or Marxist ideology, but in that of the East-West power struggle. The "class struggle" has now become an international struggle, which in turn has frozen into a stalemate, says Marcuse. There is a stalemate because the West, rather than collapsing in a crisis or erupting into imperialist wars, has consolidated its social system. This solidity of the West is based on the "permanent war economy" which it has adopted in response to the Soviet threat. Hence the Soviets' chief interest is to relax the international tension and thereby to "unfreeze" the class struggle. Relaxation, in turn, can be brought about only by "liberalization" and a rising standard of living

within the Soviet regime. This, according to Marcuse, is precisely the direction in which all the internal pressures of the regime are pointing, anyway.

The book has considerable merits; Chapter II (The Basic Self-Interpretation) is the most penetrating outline of Soviet ideology now available. But on the whole one cannot help asking why the author wrote it and to whom he was addressing himself. He does not seem to be speaking to the West any more, since he consistently agrees with Marx on the "absolute negation" of our society. Nor is he speaking to Leninists, whom he finds guilty of grievous departures from the Marxist gospel. One can only conclude that he is really speaking to himself, a Marxist who has spiritually emigrated from the West and, finding himself barred from his desired home, reflects about the ideological misunderstanding—or misfortune—that keeps him outside the doors of the country of destiny.

Radkey's work, finally, is a painstaking study of primary sources from which he has drawn a wealth of new information. He gives what seems to be the definitive account of the glory and disastrous decline of the agrarians in the Russian Revolution. If the enterprise is not all that it might have been, the cause must be found in the author's somewhat impetuous prejudice against academic study of ideologies; he brushes them aside as "rationalizations," "intellectual foam," etc. As a result, his book conveys more knowledge than understanding. He does not shed much light on the minds of decisive personalities, such as V. M. Černov, whom he could not help to penetrate except by a profound comprehension of ideas. Nor does he really grasp why the SR Party should divide into one wing akin to Bolshevism and another akin to the Kadets. What did the Bolsheviks have that the SR's did not have? The book is a clear example of the limitations of research which from the outset is committed to the proposition that ideas are beyond the pale of reality.

Gerhart Niemeyer
University of Notre Dame

Marc Raeff. Michael Speransky: Statesman of Imperial Russia 1772-1839. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1957. xi, 387 pp.

This is the first biography in a Western language of Count Mixhail Speranskij, considered by Napoleon the ablest man in the Russia of his generation and described in numerous European and American textbooks as the great reformer of the era of Alexander I.

Professor Raeff in this volume has sought successfully to show that the texts have inaccurately described Speranskij as a liberal, because he was fundamentally an efficient organizer and administrator. He modernized the government apparatus of the Russian Empire, "began" the creation of the bureaucracy which staffed the Empire through the nineteenth century, and sought, quite unsuccessfully, to introduce order, system, clarity, and the rule of law into the Russian system. He was

the perfect bureaucrat—the very model of today's organization man—and his abilities as an administrator, his lucidity and clarity of expression, and his pliancy made him a valuable aid to both Alexander I and Nicholas I.

Speranskij rose from the son of a village priest to high posts in the central government by the time he was thirty, but he was always a lonely man with a kind of inferiority complex. His social origin hampered him in his career, and his efforts to introduce order and efficiency into the government system infuriated those who battered on the good old ways of doing nothing. The chapter on his disgrace and exile, which is excellent, and the story of Speranskij's slow return to favor throw some illumination on Russian political psychology, and the reader will be tempted in this chapter to consider Soviet parallels.

Professor Raeff is at his best in describing the rise of Speranskij and his position before 1812, in analyzing his political and religious ideas, and in discussing the attitudes of various groups within the nobility. His analysis of Alexander I and his political philosophy is especially clear and concise. Moreover, the book represents an extraordinary amount of detailed and imaginative research and analysis. It illustrates quite well the great quantity of material available concerning periods now considered remote.

However, when Professor Raeff leaves intellectual biography for an analysis of government organization or law codification, his study bogs down into some confusion and disorder. This is not entirely his fault, although his style is sometimes awkward, for these are very involved subjects on which little research has been attempted, even in Russia. The biography also lacks balance, giving far less attention to the last twenty-six years than they deserved. This is perhaps due to the fact that Professor Raeff has a separate volume on Speranskij and the Siberian reforms.

Professor Raeff's fine work is marred by an uncommon number of printing errors. There are several incomplete sentences, on pages 220-221 several lines are misplaced, and misprints abound. We must assume that his careful scholarship was betrayed by an unresponsive printer. Let us hope that his publisher produces more accurate work for Professor Raeff's colleagues.

Robert F. Byrnes
Indiana University

Walter Z. Laqueur and George Lichtheim, eds. The Soviet Cultural Scene 1956-1957. (Atlantic Books.) New York: F. A. Praeger [1958]. viii, 300, \$3.75.

This volume consists of selected editorials and articles published during 1956-57 in Soviet Survey, a periodical publication sponsored by the English branch of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, and devoted to the discussion of cultural trends in the Communist part of the world. The majority of the articles is unsigned, having been written by one of the two editors,

Walter Z. Laqueur, a specialist on Communism in the Middle East, and George Lichtheim (George Arnold), the author of Pattern of World Conflict. Several of the others have been contributed by well-known specialists on Eastern affairs such as W. Kolarz, S. Utekhin, and L. Labedz. The papers touch upon a great variety of subjects, all connected in one way or another with the intellectual ferment, partly induced by Stalin's successors, partly spontaneous, that agitated the Communist world during and immediately following the Twentieth Party Congress: the discussion of literature and aesthetics, historiography, philosophy, and the unrest of the youth in Russia and the satellites. Most of them emphasize the limited scope of the officially sponsored "cultural revisionism" as well as the intensity of popular craving for a freer and richer culture: facts known better today than they were when these articles originally appeared in print.

All the articles published in this collection are written with competence and a thorough knowledge of the subject matter. The contribution of Mr. Utekhin, devoted to the educational reforms which produced striking changes in the Russian school curriculum, involving, among other things, a reduction in the hours devoted to basic subjects (mathematics included) in favor of vocational training, is well done and novel; so is the analysis of Poland written by Mr. Labedz. Several of the other papers, notably those dealing with Soviet intramural discussions of art, literature, and criticism tend to bog down in Communist jargon, and throw little light on the true nature and significance of the subject matter.

This is journalism at its best, considerably superior to what we are accustomed to on this side of the Atlantic. Still, one wonders what could have induced the editors and the publisher to reprint in book-form a collection of articles which became obsolete almost the day they appeared in print. It seems a bit pointless to be told at the close of 1958 that the speeches of Lukacs or the editorials of Leszek Kolakowski hold promise for the future. It is equally uninformative to read detailed contemporary analyses of polemics in Voprosy istorii which have long ago been settled, and never had any intrinsic value, anyway. The book thus lacks the advantages of novelty of up-to-date journalism without gaining thereby any of the advantages of perspective offered by history. Its appearance at this time must be ascribed primarily to the insatiable appetite of our reading public for matters connected with Russia and Communism.

Richard Pipes
Harvard University

Oswald P. Backus. Motives of West Russian Nobles in Deserting Lithuania for Moscow, 1377-1514. Lawrence: Univ. of Kansas Press, 1957. 174 pp., \$5.00.

It is gratifying to see a serious American historian undertaking a piece of thorough research into the Russian Middle

Ages, so remote from the reckless and turbulent Empire of Lenin and Stalin. "The purpose of this study," as the author states in the Introduction, "is to reveal more clearly the reasons for the shift of West Russian nobles from Lithuanian service to Muscovite service, and thereby to show some reasons for the increased power of the Muscovite state." The author next proceeds to discuss the geography and the governmental organization of the Lithuanian-Russian state in the period of its greatest expansion (Ch. II), the rights of the nobility as revealed in land grants (Ch. III), the rights of the nobility as revealed in privileges (Ch. IV), local officeholders (Ch. V), the position of the Orthodox Church (Ch. VI), and the motives for the desertion of individual nobles (Ch. VII).

In his conclusions, the author gives a summary of the motives for desertion from Lithuania for Moscow by West Russian princes, beginning with their dissatisfaction with the tendency toward centralization of the governmental power in the Lithuanian-Russian state, and ending with their protest against the preferred position of Roman Catholicism on the high levels of governmental organization. The available sources do not always permit one to recognize with clarity all motives which influenced the change of allegiance by West Russian princes, and Mr. Backus is critical and cautious enough to recognize that in many cases our explanation of the personal motives which caused actions of historical figures of the remote past can be given only tentatively. The text itself (110 pages) is followed by Notes (pp. 111-132), containing detailed references to the sources. These notes reveal the author's thorough acquaintance with a great amount of historical sources published in Russian, Polish, and Latin. The author is equally well versed in old and recent historical literature in Russian, Ukrainian, Polish, and German. Chapter V and Appendix II contain a long list of local officeholders within the period under scrutiny; the list will be very valuable for anybody working on the history of the Lithuanian-Russian state of this period. Each name is followed by references to the source where it is mentioned.

Though the study is written for specialists, several chapters (especially IV and VI) could be also interesting for a broader circle of readers. Every specialist can only be grateful to Mr. Backus for his scholarly work in the field of historical research and will hopefully expect the results of the promised continuation of his valuable and thorough efforts in this field.

Sergei Pushkarev
New Haven, Conn.

Clarence A. Manning. Hetman of Ukraine Ivan Mazeppa. New York: Bookman Associates [c. 1957]. 234 pp., \$3.50.

It is a happy coincidence that close upon the 250th anniversary of the death of the great Ukrainian Hetman a book of a notable American scholar has been published elucidating for the English-speaking reader his life, deeds, and the historical role he

played in Eastern Europe at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The new book of Professor Manning differs considerably from the works written by many European authors about Hetman Mazeppa. Romanticism introduced Mazeppa into literature as a romantic and legendary hero who attracted the attention of the reader more by fictitious adventures than his real individuality. Mr. Manning's work is a serious attempt to give a complete picture of the life and the political and cultural activities of one of the most interesting Ukrainian rulers and statesmen.

The author pictures the figure of the Hetman against the historical and political background of his epoch. In an easy style the author reports on Mazeppa's most significant biographical events: the beginning of his political career, his election as Hetman, the early years of his ruling, his talent as a statesman and skill as a diplomat in his extremely difficult position, his secret alliance with Swedish king, and the battle at Poltava, which brought to an end Mazeppa's hope for the political freedom of the Ukraine.

Though giving much attention to political affairs and picturing Mazeppa as a political figure, the author does not ignore Mazeppa's cultural activities or some attractive episodes of his personal life, for instance, his autumnal love. The reader has thus a complete picture of Mazeppa as a ruler, statesman, patron of culture, and human being.

The Ukrainian Hetman who made a striking attempt to free his people from foreign domination remains a controversial figure in foreign historical sources, particularly those promoting the idea of an indivisible Russia. Mazeppa—a symbol of the Ukrainians' struggle for freedom—for two and a half centuries has been branded as traitor and anathemized by the Russian Orthodox Church as a heretic. Those continuing his political credo have been scornfully called "Mazepists." The historical picture of Mazeppa is often shadowed and misrepresented by the national emotions of those to whom the indivisibility of an Empire is closer to their heart than the political aspirations of a people. Manning draws to the reader's attention all the reasons of Mazeppa's break with Peter I and his alliance with the Swedish King, describing thus the objective course of events which resulted in the declaration of his policy of an independent Ukraine.

Manning unites in his work the ability of an excellent narrator with that of a researcher. His book is actually a sort of historical biography based on the works of Kostomarov, Borščak, and Krupnyckyj, and written in the easy form of a story. Apart from the literary qualities of the book, its value consists undoubtedly first of all in presenting a true picture of the Ukrainian Hetman on the background of his stormy epoch.

C. Bida
University of Ottawa

BOOKS RECEIVED

- American Contributions to the Fourth International Congress of Slavists Moscow, September 1958. (Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, XXI.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1958. 421 pp.
- Amiran-Darejaniani: A Cycle of Medieval Georgian Tales. Tr. R. H. Stevenson. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1958. xxxiii, 240, \$6.75.
- Maximilian Braun. Der Kampf um die Wirklichkeit in der russischen Literatur. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht [1958]. 76 pp.
- Richard Charques. The Twilight of Imperial Russia. Fair Lawn, N.J.: Essential Books, 1959. 256 pp., \$6.00.
- F. M. Dostoyevsky. The Double: A Poem of St. Petersburg. Tr. George Bird. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press [c. 1958]. 254 pp., \$1.50 (pap.) and \$3.75 (cloth).
- M. K. Dziewanowski. The Communist Party of Poland: An Outline of History. (Russian Research Center Studies, 32.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959. xvi, 369, \$7.50.
- Johannes Holthusen. Studien zur Ästhetik und Poetik des russischen Symbolismus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht [1957]. 159 pp.
- Paul L. Horecky, comp. East and East Central Europe: Periodicals in English and Other West European Languages. With the assistance of Janina Wojcicka. Washington: Library of Congress, 1958. v, 126, \$0.95.
- Michael Karpovich. A Lecture on Russian History. Ed. Horace G. Lunt. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1958. 74 pp.
- Eugenie Linieff. Folk Songs of the Ukraine. Tr. Maria Safo-noff. Godfrey, Ill.: Monticello College Press [n.d.]. vii, 65 pp.
- Rufus W. Mathewson, Jr. The Positive Hero in Russian Literature. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1958. xiii, 364, \$6.00.
- Eduard Míček. The Real Tolstoy: Impressions and Evaluation. (Czech Literary Society.) Austin, Texas: Author [n.d.]. ii, 61, \$2.00.
- Boris Pasternak. Doktor Živago. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan [1959]. 567 pp., \$6.50.
- Boris Pasternak. Doctor Zhivago. Tr. Max Hayward and Manya Harari. New York: Pantheon [c. 1958]. 559 pp., \$5.00.
- Mario Pei and Fedor I. Nikanov. Getting Along in Russian. New York: Harper and Brothers [c. 1959]. viii, 260, \$3.50.
- Donald W. Treadgold. Twentieth Century Russia. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co. [c. 1959]. xiii, 550, \$7.00.

NEWS AND NOTES

AATSEEL Annual Meeting, MLA Slavic Sections, N. F. M. L. T. A. Open Meeting in New York

The Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the AATSEEL was held in New York City, from December 27 to 29, concurrently with the MLA annual meeting.

AATSEEL Program. In the first AATSEEL session, on Saturday, December 27, with Fan Parker, Brooklyn College, presiding, the following papers were read: "Tolstoj's Search for the Meaning of Life," Eduard Miček, Univ. of Texas; "Gogol' and Ukrainian Literature," W. Besoushko; "Some Interesting Characters in Old Polish Plays," Harold Segel, Univ. of Florida; "Notes on Contemporary Soviet Literary Criticism," V. Krupitsch, Villanova Univ.; "The Pattern of Leonov's Novels," Helen Muchnic, Smith College; and "Ivan Bolotnikov and Soviet Historical Fiction," Leon Twarog, Boston Univ. Papers in the session from 11:45 to 1:10, with the Rev. W. C. Jaskiewicz, Fordham Univ., as chairman, included "Folk Elements in Słowacki's Balladyna and Their Polishness," Marion M. Coleman, Alliance College; "English Loan Words in Russian," Morton Benson, Ohio Univ.; "Reflexes of Sievers' Law in Baltic and Slavic Root Morphemes," William Schmalstieg, Univ. of Kentucky; and "The Zagreb Dialect of Serbo-Croatian," Thomas Wagner, Univ. of Minnesota.

From 6:00 to 9:00 p.m. there was a symposium on the present status of Russian language teaching in American secondary schools, under the chairmanship of Helen B. Jakobson, George Washington Univ. Regional reports were given by Kyra Bostroem; Berthold Friedl, Univ. of Miami; and John Merseureau, Univ. of Michigan. Problems relating to teacher training were discussed by Harry Josselson, Wayne Univ.; Felix Oinas, Indiana Univ.; and Catherine Wolkonsky, Vassar College. Problems relating to teaching materials were discussed by Jacob Ornstein, Department of Agriculture Graduate School, Washington, D. C.; and E. Brown, McGraw-Hill Book Co.

In the morning session on Sunday, December 28, from 10:00 to 12:00, Prof. Wagner presided. The following papers were read: "Socialist Realism and Modernism in Present-Day Yugoslavia," Ante Kadić, Univ. of California (Berkeley); "The Literary Influence of James Fenimore Cooper on Adam Mickiewicz," Prof. Mersereau; "Ivan Turgenev's Russian Translation of Marko Vovchok's Short Stories," W. Lew, St. Basil's College; "Czech Literature in the Moravian Archives in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania," Anna Pircsenok, Univ. of Pennsylvania;

and "A Note on the Literary Art of Eugene Onegin," George Gibian, Smith College.

From 3:30 to 6:00 p.m. there was a symposium on the Fourth International Congress of Slavists at Moscow, September 1-10, by a panel of six of the twenty American delegates to it. The chairman was Zbigniew Folejewski, Univ. of Wisconsin. The panel included Leon Stilman, Rufus Mathewsen, and William Harkins, of Columbia Univ.; Edward Stankiewicz, Indiana Univ.; Thomas Winner, Univ. of Michigan; and Edward J. Brown, Brown Univ.

MLA Slavic Sections. Edward J. Brown was chairman and Leon Twarog, secretary, of Slavic 1: Slavic and East European Literatures, from 9:15 to 10:30 a.m. on December 29. Papers read included: "Literary Form and Style in Puškin's Letters," J. T. Shaw, Indiana Univ.; "The Christ Symbol in Blok's The Twelve," Franklin Reeve, Columbia Univ.; and "Polish Literary Scholarship Since 1956," Victor Erlich, Univ. of Washington. The 1959 officers elected were William B. Edgerton, Indiana Univ., chairman, and Ralph E. Matlaw, Princeton Univ., secretary.

Prof. Folejewski was chairman, and Dean S. Worth, Univ. of California (Los Angeles), secretary, of Slavic 2: Slavic and East European Linguistics, which met from 11:30 to 12:45 on December 29, and at which the following papers were presented: "American Work in the Field of Slavic Philology," Alfred Senn, Univ. of Pennsylvania; "Some Corrections in the Traditional Outline of the History of Russian," George Y. Shevelov, Columbia Univ.; and "On the History of Foreign Words in Russian," Gerta Hüttel Worth, Univ. of California (Los Angeles). Officers elected for 1959 were chairman, Anthony Salys, Univ. of Pennsylvania; and secretary, Michael Samilov, Stanford Univ.

A motion was presented and unanimously passed at both the Literature and Linguistics sections that the MLA Executive Council consider changing the Slavic Groups to a Section, with an additional allocation of time, or creating a third Group.

N.F.M.L.T.A. Open Meeting. Arthur P. Coleman, President of Alliance College, presided over a panel discussion on the topic "How Far Have the Modern Languages Progressed Since World War II, and What Remains to Be Done?" at an open meeting on Modern Foreign Languages, presented by the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations at 8:00 p.m. on December 30. The situation in the field of Russian in college and especially in the high school was presented by Helen B. Yakobson, George Washington University. The panel also included Elton Hocking, Purdue Univ.; Marjorie C. Johnson, U. S. Office of Education; and W. Freeman Twaddell, Brown Univ.

AATSEEL Business Meeting. The annual business meeting was held on December 28, from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m., and opened with the presidential address, "The Role of Slavists in Teaching World Literature," Zbigniew Folejewski, 1958 President of AATSEEL. This was followed by the reports of the Editor of the Journal, the Chairman of the Committee for the

Promotion of the Study of Russian in the American Secondary School, and the Secretary-Treasurer (two are printed separately below). Théodore F. Domaradzki, Univ. of Montreal, gave a report for the North American Committee for Co-operation with Polish Universities, in which he expressed thanks to institutions and scholars who have helped in this endeavor, and invited further help in arranging for donation or exchange of books with Polish universities and for the exchange of scholars. There was considerable discussion of Prof. Yakobson's report, especially her recommendation that the Committee be not only continued but renamed the Committee for Promotion of the Study of Russian and Other East European Languages in the American Secondary School. The consensus of the meeting was that the committee should be so renamed; by action of the new President of AATSEEL, this has now been done.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

1. The AATSEEL of the U.S. at its fifteenth annual meeting voted to present these observations and conclusions to the United States Commissioner of Education:

Whereas there exist in this country large groups of citizens who speak other languages in addition to English,

Whereas social and economic forces tend to discourage the children of these citizens from perfecting their frequently rudimentary knowledge of these languages,

Whereas, therefore, an actual and an even larger potential source of knowledge useful to the interests of the country are being unwittingly neglected,

Be it therefore resolved that the AATSEEL of U.S. respectfully urges the United States Commissioner of Education to consider with particular attention projects whose purpose it is to make use of and to encourage the development of languages used by various ethnic groups in this country, especially Slavic and East European.

2. Be it resolved that the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages wishes to express its sincere thanks to Dr. Kenneth W. Mildenerberger, Director of the Foreign Language Program, and to Professor George Winchester Stone, Jr., Executive Secretary of the Modern Language Association of America, for their foresight and devotion in defending foreign language interests in Washington during the deliberations of the Congress on the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and for the valuable work they put into implementing the Act after it had become law.

3. Be it resolved that the AATSEEL of U.S. express its sincere appreciation to the entire Committee on Promoting the Study of Russian in High Schools, and especially to its Chairman, Professor Helen B. Yakobson, and its Secretary, Professor Kyra Bostroem,

for the thorough, self-sacrificing, and pioneering efforts and successful results in assisting in the development of the teaching of Russian in American secondary schools and in establishing facts relevant to it.

4. Be it resolved that the AATSEEL of U.S. express its appreciation to Harry Gideonse, President of Brooklyn College, for providing funds and personnel to make possible a preliminary survey on the teaching of Russian in United States secondary schools during 1958-59.

5. Be it resolved that the AATSEEL of U.S. express its thanks to Professor Fan Parker for performing a preliminary survey on the teaching of Russian in United States secondary schools during 1958-59.

The business session concluded with the election of officers. Officers for 1959 are: president, Prof. Twarog; vice presidents: Profs. Wolkonsky, Magner, and Erlich. Prof. Ordon was reappointed by the Executive Council as Executive Secretary and Treasurer, and Prof. Shaw will continue as Editor of the Journal.

There were a number of Canadian delegates at the AATSEEL annual meeting. They took a lively interest in the papers presented and also in the activities of the business session. They have requested that the following be published:

The Canadian delegation to the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of AATSEEL, headed by Prof. T. F. Domaradzki, President of the East Canadian Association of Slavic and East European Specialists, and J. B. Rudnyćkyj, President of the Canadian Association of Slavists, agreed with the resolution aiming at the introduction in American elementary and high schools of the teaching of Slavic languages. They decided further to advocate the introduction of the teaching of Slavic languages in Canadian schools of the same level.

It was announced that the next annual meeting of the AATSEEL will be in Chicago, Illinois, Dec. 27-28, 1959.

Annual Report of the AATSEEL's Committee for Promoting the Study of Russian in Secondary Schools

When the Committee was organized in Madison, Wisconsin, in September 1957, no one could foresee the coming of the Sputnik and the tremendous upheaval it caused in the American educational circles. Along with the demands for more science courses came the demands for the inclusion of Russian language courses in secondary school curricula.

The AATSEEL's Committee found itself quite unexpectedly a center of feverish activity. The members of the Committee participated in various language teachers' conferences; four members of the Committee were asked by the MLA to organize a special conference on the teaching of Russian in secondary schools (May 24-26, 1958) [see Fall 1958 issue of the Journal, pp. 241-249—Ed.]. Two of the members participated in a

Conference on Russian Studies in American Secondary Schools sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. The Chairman was one of the speakers at the Conference.

The Committee provided information for (a) the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Education in preparation for the National Education Defense Act, (b) U.S. Office of Education Publication School Life, (c) Educators' Dispatch, New London, Connecticut, (d) Language Newsletter, Allyn and Bacon, Publishers, (e) U.S. News and World Report, (f) the New York Herald Tribune, and (g) the local Press, TV and radio stations.

Members of the Committee conducted state surveys on the status of Russian in secondary schools. The Committee established and maintained contact with the U.S. Office of Education—two reports are being distributed by Dr. Marjorie Johnston—and also with the National Association of Secondary School Principals, American Council of Learned Societies, and National Educational Television Association.

The Committee co-operated with the local school boards, state departments of education, school superintendents, foreign language supervisors, and teachers, in helping them to set up Russian programs in secondary schools.

The Committee maintained contact with the Slavic and Russian Departments of numerous colleges and universities which were interested in Russian language courses in secondary schools (University of Pa., Univ. of Miami, Indiana Univ., Univ. of Washington, Univ. of Minnesota, Yale Univ., and Harvard Univ.).

The members of the Committee served as a clearing house for numerous inquiries concerning teachers, teaching materials, and types of programs suitable for the secondary schools. The Committee was able to bring together teachers seeking employment and schools looking for teachers, directing them to Professor Ordon or providing them with information at our disposal.

The Committee members were influential in introducing Russian minors in some universities.

The Committee has been further strengthened by fuller regional representation with the addition of new members (A. Parry, Colgate Univ.; Anna Perscenok, Univ. of Pennsylvania; B. Friedl, Univ. of Miami; and N. Gershevsky, Univ. of Washington).

The Committee would like to change its name and to be known as the Committee for the Promotion of Slavic and Other East European Languages in the American Secondary School, since it is our hope that after Russian becomes established in the secondary school curricula, other Slavic languages will follow.

The Committee has been operating without any specially designated funds and all this work was carried out at a considerable financial sacrifice to the members, not to mention the demands it made on their valuable time and energy.

The Committee realizes that what it has done is only the beginning in this important area of vital interest to the whole profession; yet the Committee feels that it has performed a valuable service by putting across its "message"—an urgent

need to expand the modern foreign language curriculum on the secondary school level to include Russian, by serving as a consultative body, by providing and co-ordinating information which helped solve some of the immediate problems which faced the school administrators ready to set up Russian programs in their schools. The AATSEEL's Committee was there ready to help when help was needed, when there was no other organization ready or willing to provide the services that our Committee has provided. In this respect, our Committee has provided a unique and most important service to the Nation!

We wish to take this opportunity to thank all the many volunteers without whose help the Committee's work would not have been possible.

Helen B. Yakobson, Chairman

[Editor's note: The name of the committee has been changed as recommended in this report, and Prof. Yakobson continues as chairman. Names of members of the Committee will be published in the Summer issue.]

Executive Secretary and Treasurer's Report for 1958

The Executive Council, at its meeting of December 27, 1958, decided upon a number of measures intended to promote greater efficiency of the AATSEEL's operations. The Executive Secretary-Treasurer was instructed to mail notices concerning forthcoming Annual Meetings to the membership on the first of November. He was also empowered to establish a registration fee to cover the expenses of the Annual Meeting. One corollary of these changes is that members wishing to read papers must present them to the Secretary-Treasurer no later than the first of October preceding the December meeting. Actually a much earlier time is recommended, since the program is usually fully made up by October 1.

The Executive Council also instructed the Secretary-Treasurer to enforce a stricter policy with members in arrears than has been followed. No member in arrears for 1958 will continue to receive the SEEL until he has again become a member in good standing. And any other member who is in arrears six months will cease to receive the SEEL. It was also decided, in keepin with the practice of most other scholarly organizations, that receipts would be sent only to those members specifically requesting them, since a canceled check is in itself a bona-fide receipt.

The Executive Council expressed the hope that new AATSEEL Chapters would be organized and once again reminded officers of existing Chapters that only members of the AATSEEL in good standing may be members of AATSEEL Chapters.

The Executive Council decided also that the AATSEEL placement agency which had been centralized in the office of the Secretary-Treasurer should be decentralized. To this end the Secretary-Treasurer was instructed to communicate with those universities in the various regions of the country in which Slavic and East European studies are developed or are

developing to secure their co-operation as placement and accreditation centers.

The financial report given below shows that, as of January 1, 1959, the AATSEEL is in debt. A number of factors contribute to the deficit. The increased size of SEEJ has increased printing costs, but it is not the intention of the Editor or of the Secretary-Treasurer to decrease the number of pages in the SEEJ; quite the contrary. Increased mailing costs have also been a substantial factor. But the deciding factor has been the large number of members in arrears, who have caused a deficit rather than a small surplus. The Secretary-Treasurer is confident that the stricter policy enjoined on him by the Executive Council, as well as increased interest in the SEEJ by advertisers will make it possible for the AATSEEL to end 1959 in the black.

Balance carried forward from 1957	\$ 89.73
<u>Receipts</u>	
Memberships	1272.00
Advertisements	467.00
Reprints	50.00
Total.....	<u>\$1878.73</u>

Disbursements

Printing and shipping of Vol. XVI of	
the <u>SEEJ</u> and reprints	\$1852.84
Advertisement in MLA program booklet....	44.00
Bank charges.....	16.00
Stamps, envelopes, supplies, and	
secretarial help	298.75
Total.....	<u>\$2111.59</u>
Members in arrears to the amount of	\$ 290.00
Deficit for 1958.....	<u>232.86</u>
Difference	\$ 57.14

Edmund Ordon

AATSEEL Chapter and Other Professional Meetings and Organizations

The Fall Conference of the New York State Chapter of AATSEEL, was devoted to gifted students and scientific Russian, and held at the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y., Oct. 25, 1958. Reports given included "More Russian in More Schools," Kyra T. Bostroem, Univ. of Connecticut; "Teaching Russian to Gifted Students," Helen Trofimoff, Syracuse Univ. (a six-weeks program for gifted children, last summer, at Utica, N. Y.); "Scientific Russian in American Classrooms," George E. Condoyannis, St. Peter's College, Jersey City, N. J.; "Teaching Scientific Russian by Television," Irving S. Bengelsdorf, General Electric Company, Schenectady, N. Y.; and "Russian Scientific Translations: Collection, Control, and Dissemination," Lillian A. Hamrick, Office of Technical Services, U. S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

The following officers of the New York Chapter of the AATSEEL were re-elected for one more year: president, Prof. Albert Parry, of Colgate Univ.; vice presidents, Prof. Catherine Wolkonsky, Vassar College, and Prof. Olga K. Woronoff, Manhattanville College. Newly elected to the post of the Chapter's Secretary-Treasurer was Mrs. Olga Fedoroff of USAFIT, Syracuse University, to replace Dr. S. J. Sluszkowski of Floral Park, Long Island, who became a vice president.

The next meeting—Spring Conference—of the New York State Chapter is scheduled for Friday and Saturday, May 15-16, 1959, at Columbia University in New York, with Columbia's Department of Slavic Languages as host. The opening session, on Friday evening, will be devoted to the subject "Who Should Teach Russian?" which will be covered by two speakers: Mr. Paul M. Glaude, Acting Supervisor of Foreign Language Education, New York State Education Department, Albany, N. Y.; and Dr. George B. Carson, Jr., Staff Director of the Conference on Russian Studies in American Secondary Education, Washington, D. C. On Saturday one of the two sessions will be devoted to a symposium on "Teaching Methods and Textbooks," with participants from leading Slavic departments of the Northeast.

Albert Parry (Colgate)

The Slavic Section of South Atlantic Modern Language Association met in Augusta, Georgia, November 6, at 8 p. m. Prof. Berthold C. Friedl, Univ. of Miami was chairman, and Albert Kaspin, Univ. of Tennessee, co-chairman; the secretary was Harold B. Segel, Univ. of Florida. The program began with "Russian Studies in the SAMLA Territory—the 1958 Survey," a discussion led by the chairman. Next there was a "Symposium on the Teaching of Russian in Secondary Schools," by Grace D. Brown, Miami Beach High School; Michael Negrich; North Miami High School; Walter F. Walker, Hialeah High School; and Virginia Williamson, Miami Jackson High School. Papers presented included: "Russian in the Curriculum of a Junior College," Tina Riegler, Manatee Junior College; "Principles of an Elementary Russian Textbook 'in the New Key,'" Eva Friedl, Univ. of Miami; "The One-Year Russian Course at the Army Language School," Max Oppenheimer, Jr., Florida State Univ.; and "Alexander Sukhovo-Kobylin's Trilogy: A Reappraisal," Prof. Segel.

The Fifth Annual Convention of the Canadian Association of Slavists was held at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada, June 14-16, 1958. In addition to several papers being read and discussed, there was discussion of a special topic, the transliteration of Cyrillic alphabets. It was decided to recommend the international transliteration of scholarly (linguistic) use and two practical (English and French) transliterations for other purposes. Officers elected were J. B. Rudnyčkyj, Univ. of Manitoba, president; Orest Starchuk, Univ. of Alberta, vice president; and C. H. Bedford, Univ. of Toronto, secretary-treasurer.

At the Sixth International Congress of Onomastic Sciences, held in Munich, West Germany, Aug. 24-26, 1958, American onomastics was represented by two Slavists, J. B. Rudnyćkyj, Univ. of Manitoba; and Alfred Senn, Univ. of Pennsylvania. Prof. Rudnyćkyj read a paper, "Slavic Surnames in Canada and the U.S.A." At a meeting of the Subcommittee on Cyrillic Transliteration of Names, of which Prof. Rudnyćkyj was a member, it was decided to recommend the international Slavistic transliteration [as used in this Journal-Ed.] for general use in the world.

The International Association of Slavonic Languages and Literatures, one of the several international associations of scholars that are grouped in the *Fédération Internationale des Langues et Littératures Modernes* (FILLM), invites American members. Its Council is composed of the following officers: president, Prof. B. O. Unbegaun (Oxford); vice presidents, Prof. D. Tschizewskij (Univ. of Heidelberg), Prof. Gleb Struve (Univ. of California, Berkeley); secretary, Dr. R. Auty (Univ. of Cambridge); treasurer, Prof. D. Gerhardt (Univ. of Münster). Additional members of the Council include Prof. V. Erlich (Univ. of Washington, Seattle), Prof. E. Lo Gatto (Rome), Prof. M. Markovitch (Nancy), Prof. J. Matl (Graz), Prof. K. Taranowski (Belgrade). Annual dues are 1000 French francs, which are to be sent to the Treasurer; at the same time, the member should inform the Secretary that he has paid the dues.

National Conference of FL Teachers. This conference held in New York December, 6-7, 1958, received first-hand information about the National Defense Education Act from Dr. John R. Ludington, Dr. Kenneth Mildemberger, and Dr. Marjorie C. Johnston of the U.S. Office of Education; learned about the undertaking of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers (in response to a request from the U.S. National Commission of UNESCO) to discuss throughout the states the need for languages in the schools; engaged in three discussion groups (language laboratories, language institutes, and language representation in state educational organizations) led by Drs. A. Bruce Gaarder (LSU), Nelson Brooks (Yale), and Archibald T. MacAllister (Princeton) respectively; and learned about the state plans (under Title III of the Act) for New York and Connecticut.

The Slavic section of the Twelfth University of Kentucky Foreign Language Conference, Lexington, Ky., April 24-25, will include an extensive program of papers in Slavic linguistics, literature, and pedagogy. Prof. William Schmalstieg is in charge of the Slavic section of the program.

Summer Programs 1959

Middlebury College. The Russian School will have its fifteenth session, under the directorship of Prof. Mischa Fayer, from June 26 to Aug. 13, with its customary extensive course offerings and staff of native teachers. The Institute of Soviet Studies, for giving the American specializing in the social or

natural sciences oral as well as reading competence in Russian, has been made a permanent feature.

Colby College. The Colby College Summer School of Languages, directed by Prof. John F. McCoy, again offers intensive courses on the college level in French, German, Russian, and Spanish, in its twelfth session, from June 22 to August 8, 1959. Courses given 6 semester hours of credit. The enrollment will be restricted to 150 students, of whom 30 may be in Russian. There will be 19-20 instructors.

Fordham University. Courses in Russian and Lithuanian languages and culture will be given in the Institute of Russian Studies, from July 6 to Aug. 14. Prof. Walter C. Jaskiewicz is again the director of these summer programs.

Indiana University. The Ninth Russian Workshop and Institute for Teachers has been expanded so as to be an eight-week program, giving 9 or 10 semester hours of credit, and allowing a student to complete the equivalent of an entire year of intensive Russian language training on the elementary, second-year, third-year, or advanced level. It will be held, under the directorship of J. T. Shaw, from June 15 to August 7.

In Brief

"New Series" Designation of the Journal. Since the publication of the AATSEEL was so basically changed when it was renamed in 1957 as The Slavic and East European Journal, and since the Journal has become well established in its present form of a journal of scholarship and pedagogy, it was decided at the Annual AATSEEL Meeting in New York in December to designate the Journal as a "New Series" from the time of its existence in its present form. Each number this year, beginning with this issue, will be designated Vol. XVII (New Series, Vol. III), to indicate the volume number as an AATSEEL publication and the volume number of the Journal as presently constituted. Next year, the numbering will be indicated as follows: New Series, Vol. IV (XVIII). Individuals and libraries may subscribe for back numbers of all issues of the Journal since the New Series began in 1957 and thus have a complete file of this publication as a scholarly journal.

International Film Bureau, Inc., 57 E. Jackson Boulevard, Chicago 4, Illinois, is planning to produce a series of films for use in teaching the Russian language. Information on colleges and schools teaching Russian is desired. Also information which will be of use in planning such a series of films.

The University of Michigan Press has published Boris Pasternak's Doktor Zivago in the original Russian [see above, Books Received, p. 94], as the first of a number of planned publications in the Russian language, including writings by Zamjatin, Zoščenko, Belyj, and others. The plan is to confine these Russian-language publications to works suppressed within the Soviet Union. Suggestions of specific works to be included in the program are invited by the Press.

What's in a Patronymic? The first known woman Ph.D. in the United States gave her only child a Russian-style patronymic as middle name. Miss Helen Magill became the first woman Ph.D. in the U.S. when she earned the degree in classics at Boston University in 1877. In 1890 she was married to Professor Andrew Dickson White of Cornell University, who became U.S. Minister to Russia in 1892. Their only child was born in Helsingfors, Finland—then under Russian rule—on July 9, 1893, and was given the name at Karin Andreevna White.

— Information drawn from Walter Crosby Eels, "Earned Doctorates for Women in the Nineteenth Century," AAUP Bulletin, XLII (1956), 645.

Rockefeller FL Grant. All members of the AATSEEL, the Modern Language Association, and all FL teachers, as well as a considerable portion of informed American society, will join in sincere thanks to the Rockefeller Foundation for generous six-year (1952-58) support to the first phase of the Foreign Language Program of the MLA. The FLP began as an attempt to understand the dimensions and the problems of a critical situation and to initiate some steps to remedy that situation. The Rockefeller Foundation has given the staff complete freedom of action in pursuing this aim, and full advantage was taken in ranging far and wide in conferences, studies, and projects. One of the conferences included in this program was that on Teaching Russian in American Secondary Schools—the report of which was published in the Fall 1958 issue of the Journal and an extra copy sent all subscribers of the Journal. The FLP does not end with the termination of the grant, for the Executive Council of the MLA has made it a permanent function of the MLA.

AATSEEL Chapters

At present there are seven active AATSEEL Chapters: New York, New England, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Washington D.C., Ohio, and Texas. Their officers (as well as AATSEEL national officers) are listed on the inside front cover of the Journal. According to AATSEEL Bylaws, the procedure for establishing new chapters is as follows (Bylaw 2):

Within the Association, local Chapters may be organized. The Charter of a Chapter may be issued by the Executive Secretary and Treasurer and countersigned by the President upon petition of seven or more members of the National Association, after approval of the petition of the Executive Council.

The Executive Secretary and Treasurer points out that there should be new and reactivated chapters in many sections of the country where now none exist. He will be pleased to receive petition for charters.

ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE

To assist in the placement of high school and college teachers in the field, the AATSEEL publishes notices of academic vacancies and teachers available. Factual data and expressions of personal preference in the notices will be published as submitted. Appointing officers and teachers may publish names and addresses or use key numbers, as they choose. A member of the Association may have one free announcement of his availability, not to exceed 100 words or 10 printed lines, during each volume-year. Subsequent insertions or announcements from non-members will be charged for at the rate of 50 cents each line. There is no charge to institutions for the announcement of academic vacancies. Copy should be forwarded two months in advance of publications dates of Jan. 15, Apr. 15, July 15, and Oct. 15. Such announcements and all correspondence to key numbers should be sent to Dr. Edmund Ordon, Executive Secretary and Treasurer of the AATSEEL, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

Teachers Available

Desire teaching position in Slavic (especially Russian) language and/or literature. Education: Boston U., A.B. (1938); Pacific School of Religion, B.D. (1942); U. Lausanne, 1947-1948; U. Paris, 1948-1950 (Diploma in Russian, 1949); Harvard U., 3 semesters (1950-1954, all requirements except thesis met for Ph.D.). Pertinent work experience: Library of Congress in Slavic field (present employment), 5 years; Air Force Language Training Program at Indiana U. (Serbo-Croatian), 1 year; part-time Russian language teaching for U. Maryland, George Washington U., John Hopkins U. A 1001.

Sorbonne graduate in Russian looking for position as Russian teacher H.S. or college—French citizen, immigration visa. East coast or N.Y. vicinity preferable. Can also teach French and German. For further information write to Mrs. Galina Goldammer, 84-15, 172nd St, Jamaica (32), N.Y.

BOOKS ABROAD

An International Literary Quarterly

Established in 1927 by Roy Temple House to promote
international understanding by disseminating literary information

Editor and Manager: Ernst Erich Noth

Featuring articles on the situation and evolution of the world's various national literatures, contemporary authors, literary trends and schools; reviews of recently published foreign books in the fields of creative writing, literary criticism, and all branches of the humanities; and a selective bibliographical appraisal of four hundred American and foreign literary and cultural periodicals.

"The Euramerica of criticism."—*J. F. Angelloz.*

"The conception of a 'world literature' brought nearer its realization."—*Max Brod.*

"Helpfully widens the horizon of critics and readers."—*Lion Feuchtwanger.*

"The only international critical publication which is at the same time complete, objective, and careful of literary standards."—*André Maurois.*

"Revelation and fulfillment of love for all mankind."—*Walter von Molo.*

"A first unity among the Nations."—*Sean O'Casey.*

"A unique publication in character and coverage."—*Alfonso Reyes.*

"A patient and important service in making the books of the rest of the world available to Americans."—*Upton Sinclair.*

\$1.25 a copy; \$4.00 a year; two years \$7.00

Mail subscriptions to:
Circulation Manager, Books Abroad,
University of Oklahoma Press
Norman, Okla.

THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

The only American journal concentrating in research in the humanities and pedagogy in the field; articles, reviews, news and notes

Published by the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages (AATSEEL) through the facilities of Indiana University

Subscription includes membership in the AATSEEL for individuals. Subscription-membership: \$5.00 per year; \$2.00 for undergraduate and graduate students

Members will receive, through an arrangement with the Indiana University Slavic and East European Series, two bonus volumes during 1959:

Indiana Slavic Studies, Vol. II, ed. Michael Ginsburg and Joseph T. Shaw

The American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies for 1958

For subscriptions, advertising rates, and back numbers, write to Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the AATSEEL,

Edmund Ordon
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

"The outstanding general journal of modern language teaching in the United States"

THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL

brings to its readers every month stimulating and helpful articles on methods, materials, pedagogical research, publications and textbooks in the field.

Edited by J. Alan Pfeffer, The University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y. Published by the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations.

Eight issues a year, monthly except June, July, August, and September. Current subscription \$4.00 a year. Foreign countries, \$4.50 a year net in U.S.A. funds.

Sample copy on request

The Modern Language Journal

Stephen L. Pitcher, Business Manager

7144 Washington Avenue
ST. LOUIS 5, MISSOURI

INDIANA UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS

Graduate School

SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN SERIES

Editorial Committee

Vaclav L. Benes, Robert F. Byrnes, Michael Ginsburg, Norman J. G. Pounds, Thomas A. Sebeok, Nicolas Spulber, Oscar O. Winther

No. 1	Eeva K. Minn, STUDIES IN CHEREMIS, Vol. IV, DERIVATION (1956).	\$2.00
No. 2	Michael Ginsburg and Joseph T. Shaw, Eds., INDIANA SLAVIC STUDIES, Vol. I (1956).	\$3.00
No. 3	Piotr S. Wandycz, CZECHOSLOVAK-POLISH CONFEDERATION (1956).	\$2.50
No. 4	Norman J. G. Pounds and Nicolas Spulber, Eds., RESOURCES AND PLANNING IN EASTERN EUROPE (1957).	\$2.50
No. 5	Robert N. Pehrson, THE BILATERAL NETWORK OF SOCIAL RELATIONS IN KÖNKÄMÄ LAPP DISTRICT (1956). (Out of print.)	\$2.50
No. 6	C. Leonard Lundin, FINLAND IN THE SECOND WORLD WAR (1956).	\$4.50
No. 7	Mark V. Vishniak, "SOVREMENNYE ZAPISKI"—MEMOIRS OF THE EDITOR (1957). [In Russian.]	\$4.00
No. 8	Leonard Newmark, STRUCTURAL GRAMMAR OF ALBANIAN (1957). (Out of print.)	\$2.50
No. 9	Joseph T. Shaw, Ed., with others, THE 1956 AMERICAN BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES IN LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, FOLKLORE, AND PEDAGOGY (1957).	\$1.00
No. 10	Joseph T. Shaw, Ed., with others, THE AMERICAN BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES FOR 1957 (1958).	\$2.00
No. 11	Norman J. G. Pounds, THE UPPER SILESIAN INDUSTRIAL REGION (1958).	\$4.00
No. 12	Robert F. Byrnes, BIBLIOGRAPHY OF AMERICAN PUBLICATIONS ON EAST CENTRAL EUROPE, 1945-1957 (1958).	\$2.50
No. 13	Michael Ginsburg and Joseph T. Shaw, Eds., INDIANA SLAVIC STUDIES, Vol. II (1958).	\$3.00
No. 14	V. Benes, R. Byrnes, and N. Spulber, THE SECOND SOVIET-YUGOSLAV DISPUTE (Full text of main documents) (1959). [In preparation.]	\$3.50

Lilien's ENGLISH-POLISH DICTIONARY is now distributed in connection with this Series. Fascicles 1-19 are available at \$1.50 each.

All correspondence should be addressed to the Editorial Committee, Rayl House, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.